

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XLIV, No. 18
WHOLE No. 1115

February 7, 1931

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

	PAGES
CHRONICLE	417-420
EDITORIALS	
The Teaching Doctor—The Unacceptable Amendment—February 12, 1809—Usury and House Rent—Charity or Philanthropy?—Christianizing the Red Cross.....	421-423
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Origin of the Birth-Control Idea—Keeping Pace with Time—All of a Monday Morning—War Dangers in Europe: III. The International Aspect	424-431
EDUCATION	
Life in a Test-Tube	431-432
SOCIOLOGY	
A Picture of Prohibition.....	432-434
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF	434-435
POETRY	
Ballade of the Unborn.....	431
LITERATURE	
Some Novelists in Tradition	436-437
REVIEWS	437-439
COMMUNICATIONS	440

Chronicle

Home News.—The conflict between Congress and the Red Cross reached a crisis on January 28, when Chairman Payne, of the Red Cross, testifying before the House Committee on Appropriations, said that the Red Cross was capable of dealing with the drought situation, and that it could not accept the administration of the \$25,000,000 appropriation for general relief purposes in all the States. "All we pray for is for Congress to let us alone." This statement led to severe criticism of the Red Cross by minority leaders in the Senate, who accused the President of playing politics with human suffering, and stated that his approval of Judge Payne's position would probably make an extra session of Congress necessary. On January 29, the House Appropriations Committee rejected the Red Cross appropriation.

Secretary of the Treasury Mellon appeared before the Senate Finance Committee on January 28 to protest that cash redemption of the soldiers' bonus would seriously affect the credit of the Government. The Government, he asserted, could not sell bonds to the value of \$3,400,000,000 "without complete disorganization of the Government and other security markets, with the most serious conse-

quences, not only to the public credit, but to our entire economic structure."

On the same day, Assistant Secretary of State Seymour Lowman opposed the embargo on Soviet exportations proposed by the Kendall bill, and also the sending of American investigators to Russia, since they would probably be lined up against a wall, and shot. The chief plea against the bill was made by H. L. Cooper, of the Russian-American Chamber of Commerce. He denied that the Soviet dealt in convict-made goods, and said that more men go to church in Russia than in any other country in the world. Representative Fish, contending that the purpose of the Soviet was world-wide revolution, differed from Mr. Cooper's assertion that its purpose was purely economic.

On January 26, the proposal made by Senator Tydings, of Maryland, to investigate the report of the Wickersham Commission, was laid aside, and the Howell bill, providing stricter Prohibition enforcement in the District of Columbia, was taken up. The debate was both discursive and sharp, ranging from discussion of the drought conditions to the Red Cross and Muscle Shoals. As the bill promised to align the "wets" and the "drys" in the Senate, it was hoped that a vote might be avoided, and on January 27, acting under an earlier agreement, the bill was displaced for consideration of the army appropriations bill.

The fight on the President's appointment of Messrs. Smith, Garsaud, and Draper to the Federal Power Commission, was revived on January 26, when the Senate Judiciary Committee, by a vote of eight to three, approved a resolution introduced by Senator Walsh, of Montana. This resolution requests the United States attorney in the District of Columbia to begin *quo warranto* proceedings against the three commissioners. Should the attorney decline, any "interested person" may take steps to inquire by what warrant the commissioners hold office. As no speedy decision can be obtained from the courts, the resolution was felt to be little more than a gesture of disapproval, which, however, may influence future legislation.

Two incidents which called for diplomatic action have been taken up by the Government. On January 24, a coast-guard cutter, patrolling the New Jersey coast, fired upon an alleged Canadian rum-runner, and killed the captain. The Canadian sailors claimed that their boat was outside the one-hour sailing limit. Information was requested by the Canadian Legation at Washington. Major Gen-

eral Smedley Butler, of the Marines, figured in the second incident. It was said that in a speech in Philadelphia last month he had referred to Premier Mussolini in a most derogatory manner. Representations having been made by the Italian Ambassador, General Butler was arrested and a court martial ordered, on January 29, by the Secretary of the Navy. On the same day, Secretary of State Stimson, dispatched a letter of apology to the Italian Government.

Australia.—Sir Isaac Isaacs was sworn in as Governor General of the Commonwealth on January 22. He succeeded Baron Stonehaven, whose term of office ended in October. Sir Isaac is the first native-born Australian to hold the post. He has had a distinguished political and judicial career, his last office having been that of Chief Justice of Australia.—The Prime Minister, James H. Scullin, found his Labor party seriously divided upon his return from the London Imperial Conference in early January. The differences concerned, principally, the policies for the financial rehabilitation of Australia. In view of the very critical condition of private and public finances that has been growing worse during the past year, the moderates and the extremists within the Labor ranks have each offered contradictory plans. During Mr. Scullin's absence, the extremists, who advocate a repudiation of debts and an enforced inflation, almost controlled the party. That the situation was precarious was evident from such a statement as that of the Health Commissioner, Frank Anstey, which declared: "Our present financial position undoubtedly is leading to national bankruptcy. Within two months the banks will close down on all governments. After that, chaos; after that, reconstruction along entirely new lines." There has been a consistent raise in the Australian rate of exchange, the highest being eighteen per cent. Meanwhile, according to federal statistics, the number of unemployed has reached 200,000, of whom more than half are trade unionists. A further complication in the Cabinet itself was the reinstatement of E. G. Theodore as Federal Treasurer. He had resigned last summer when charges of corruption were made against him as head of the Queensland Government. The charges were never proved, and Mr. Scullin advocated his reinstatement in office. J. E. Fenton, who acted as Prime Minister during Mr. Scullin's absence, resigned as Minister of Trade.

Bolivia.—While the decree to convoke the newly elected Congress was announced as being drawn up in the middle of January, considerable uneasiness was created in political circles because its issuance was delayed. Responsibility for this was laid to two groups of army officers charged with exerting pressure to prolong military rule, one justifying the delay because of political party quarrels still carried over since the election and professing merely to await complete political peace before a return to civilian rule; the other, though smaller, anxious to hold on to a military junta indefinitely.

Brazil.—Red plots for agitation against the Government so as to instigate an uprising and attacks on food shops in the capital because of the economic depression were discovered on January 22 and only frustrated by the quick action of the Rio de Janeiro police. Meanwhile the economic condition continued critical. Despite 22,000,000 sacks of surplus coffee and a retail selling price of ten cents per pound, the Provisional Government deemed it necessary to conduct an investigation among the roasters to discover those guilty of adulterating coffee with cheap substitutes. The investigation disclosed that of sixty-one roasters in the capital only one sold pure coffee. In consequence, the President signed a decree imposing severe penalties on those marketing the adulterated article. The Government also showed renewed interest in the State social reorganization, manifesting especially anxiety, according to a dispatch to the *New York Times*, "to abolish the peculiar form of slavery now existing whereby both whites and blacks are often bound to jobs, being unable to pay back money loaned them by their employers. The custom originated through the workers' inability to live on the wages earned with subsequent indebtedness to the employers. The reforms planned include minimum wage scales and a law forbidding employers to sell workers for the price of their indebtedness."

Cuba.—During the week President Machado's troubles did not abate. Suppressed newspapers continued their struggle for freedom of the press and carried their fight into the courts, where the Presidential decree was unanimously declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Justices. Bombing and firing of sugar plantations continued, and in the province of Matanzas nearly 2,000,000 pounds of cane were fired. On January 28, the Government announced the discovery of a plot to force intervention by the United States by blowing up sugar mills owned by American citizens. The Reds were active and a number were arrested. A long discussion on the tariff bills brought about many amendments, though it resulted in the final passage of the measure both in the House of Representatives and the Senate. The law raises tariffs drastically and was passed as an emergency economic bill under strong protest, among the leaders of the opposition being the American Chamber of Commerce in Havana. On January 26, the House of Representatives voted to authorize the President to continue the suspension of individual constitutional rights indefinitely. It was anticipated that the Senate would concur in the action.

France.—After the defeat of the short-lived Steeg Cabinet on January 22, President Doumergue began his search for a new Premier, offering the post first to Foreign Minister Briand, who declined the offer in view of the press of work of the Foreign Office. The choice then fell to Senator Pierre Laval, and on January 27 he announced the completion of his list of Ministers, which was accepted by the President. The Laval Cabinet contains more than

New Gov. Gen.;
Government
Weakness

Financial and
Industrial
Problems

Government
Troubles

Civil
Rule
Delayed

Laval New
Premier

a dozen Ministers and Under-Secretaries of the Tardieu Government, adding others, to the total of thirty (eighteen Ministers and twelve Under-Secretaries) from the several groups of the Center and Right. M. Briand retained his post at the Foreign Office, as he had done in the last eight Governments. M. Tardieu accepted the Agriculture portfolio. Offers which M. Laval made to the Radical-Socialist group, to induce them to enter a coalition of all parties to the right of the Socialist benches, were rejected, pursuant of the party's reiterated declaration of non-cooperation with the Republican-Democratic Union. The life of the Laval Ministry seemed to be dependent on the support of some of the highly unstable units of the Left Center, notably the fifty-odd members of the Left Radical group, several of whom accepted posts in the two brief Left Cabinets of the last year, while the bulk of the party has generally followed the Poincaré-Tardieu tradition. In the lack of effective party discipline, M. Laval strove to win and retain their full allegiance by assigning five portfolios to their leaders.

Germany.—Reports of the granting of an extensive credit to Germany resulted in the disclosure that negotiations between Berlin and Paris had been under way with the promise of a satisfactory conclusion. Berlin, it was said, hesitated when confronted with the "political conditions"

Loan Negotiations

which France attached to the operation. Conjecture made the loan or credit a short-term operation for 100,000,000 reichmarks (about \$23,800,000), in the granting of which certain unrevealed American banking houses would have a share.—Chancellor Bruening, addressing 4,000 industrialists at Chemnitz, pointed to the fact that the German people for once were united in a demand for revision, but stated that Germany's salvation would not come from revision of the Young plan alone. Suggesting remedial measures for Germany's present burdens, the Chancellor said they were twofold: firstly, savings by reduction in the cost of production and expenditures in administration; and secondly, by endeavoring to accomplish the greatest possible results with smaller means. The Chancellor advised the people to unite for reconstructive work and to be on guard against illusions. Lack of capital, he said, would inevitably result in reform of unemployment insurance. The Chancellor was greeted by a crowd shouting, "Down with him." The assembly had gathered under the slogan "Saxony Needs Work."

Great Britain.—Another real danger to the continuance in power of the Labor Government was averted on January 28 by the passage of the second reading of the Trades Dispute bill by a majority of twenty-seven. The principal issue in the bill was the repeal of the measure passed by the Conservative Government in 1927 which would render impossible such a general strike as took place in 1926, and which would tend to make labor strikes illegal. The MacDonald Government was forced to proceed with the bill by the trades-union elements among the Laborites. The Conservatives opposed the bill

solidly. The Liberals, while condemning the bill, were unwilling to use the balance of power to bring about the downfall of the Labor Government. In the vote, eight Liberals joined Sir John Simon against the bill; the other fifty Liberals, with Lloyd George, abstained from voting, thus allowing the normal Labor majority. A later vote, by a majority of sixty-seven, sent the bill to the committee stage where, it was anticipated, Conservative and Liberal amendments would probably destroy it. A more impressive victory for Mr. MacDonald was the acceptance by both Conservatives and Liberals of the White Paper giving the results of the Indian Round Table Conference. Stanley Baldwin, leader of the Conservatives, declared that if his party were in power it would implement the proposals to grant India a Constitution. The dissenters were led by Winston Churchill, who delivered a violent attack on the Indian negotiations; his position was repudiated by Mr. Baldwin. After the debate on the Conference, the announcement was made of the release of Mahatma Gandhi. This provoked a serious attack from the Conservatives, especially in the press, as a weakness on the part of the Government and as likely to lead to greater disturbances in India.

India.—Mahatma Gandhi, leader of the Indian nationalists, was released from prison, unconditionally, by Lord Irwin, Viceroy, on January 26. Gandhi was arrested on

Gandhi Released

May 5 on the charge of creating public disorder through his civil-disobedience program and his violation of the salt laws. His release came through the orders of Premier MacDonald so that he and the leaders of the All India Congress would be enabled to deliberate on the results of the Indian Round Table Congress recently concluded in London. The ban on the All India Congress as an unlawful association was removed. In order to avoid demonstrations, Gandhi left Yerovda prison, at Poona, near midnight and entrained for Bombay. Upon his arrival, he was welcomed at a huge mass meeting. He declared that the civil-disobedience campaign would be continued, no matter what the nature of the Government was, until the abuses it attacked were removed. He also demanded the unconditional release of the 50,000 political prisoners still in jail. About thirty other prisoners, members of the Congress Working Committee, were also given their freedom; these included Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, president of the Congress.

Italy.—The city-planning commission appointed by Premier Mussolini to study the expansion and modernization of Rome presented a report on January 27. It proposed the opening of new streets, the building of subways and new railroad terminals, and the restoration of many ancient monuments and buildings. It also advocated the development and incorporation into the city of more than twenty-five square miles of suburban territory, chiefly for residential purposes, and provided for numerous parks and boulevards. The project is based on a future urban population of 2,000,000.

Labor Victories

Jugoslavia.—Crowds estimated officially at 160,000 were on hand to greet King Alexander and Queen Marie at their arrival in Zagreb, capital of Croatia, on January 25. This visit was looked upon as having the highest political significance, especially in view of recent Croatian Nationalist bombings. The words of welcome expressed by the Mayor of Zagreb at the station expressed Croatian loyalty to the Yugoslav state and implied rejection of Hungarian and Italian hopes that they might break away from it.—A severe influenza epidemic was raging in various parts of the Kingdom.

Poland.—It was estimated that one-third of Poland's total industrial population was registered as unemployed. The steel, coal and textile industries showed a great falling off since 1929. The plight of agriculture was still worse. The Government advocated a readjustment of industrial and agricultural prices, but opposed wage reductions for industrial workers. Poland determined to do away with what still remains of her prohibition measures voted ten years ago. Premier Slawek declared that the Government saw no necessity for a special inquiry into the Brest-Litovsk prison affair, since there was no evidence of maltreatment of prisoners. The Premier's statement was supported by a Government majority of 233 against 150, rejecting the Opposition's demand for a special investigation. The Sejm also approved the program for "pacification" of the Ukrainian populace of Eastern Galicia, rejecting a Ukrainian motion for a Parliamentary committee of investigation. General Skladkowski, Minister of the Interior, declared that a secret Ukrainian military organization, subsidized by foreign sources, was carrying on a campaign of sabotage among the peaceful population. He said he preferred to send a punitive expedition and declare martial law, since it was the Government's duty to free the country from the "gangsterism" of this organization.

Russia.—An estimate was made on January 25 that about 13,000 foreign specialists would be needed in 1931 in order to carry out the industrial program of the Five Year plan. This would include 3,000 engineers, 3,000 foremen, and about 7,000 skilled workers. Europe was expected to supply about 2,600 of the engineers and the same number of foremen, and about 5,000 skilled workers. The rest would be sought in America. The total exports by the beginning of January, 1931, amounted to 3,500,000 metric tons of all grains, of which about 2,250,000 tons was wheat. More than 500,000 tons of grain were exported in September, more than 1,250,000 tons in October, and 1,000,000 tons in November. The December rate was said to approximate that of November. A surplus of 6,000,000 tons of grain was estimated to be on hand above what was needed for the urban population and the army.—Official reports, according to the New York Times correspondent, complained of an alarming increase of immorality amongst the wives of workers.

Spain.—On January 26, the Government terminated the state of martial law—in force since the attempted revolt of mid-December—except in Madrid and Saragossa, where military rule was continued for the time, due to the presence of several prisoners awaiting trial for their part in the rebellion. The return to the civil regime was construed as a step in preparation for the national elections, which, in spite of repeated rumors of a military dictatorship, the Premier declared his intention of carrying through within the next two months. Republican agitators continued their propaganda for a constitutional convention or a plebiscite on the continuation of the monarchy, which step they asserted must be taken before holding elections. Their campaign, except in student circles, was peaceable and orderly. At the universities, however, groups of students stirred up trouble, and took advantage of their immunity from police regulation in the academic enclosure. Several clashes occurred between opposing camps of undergraduates who forsook their studies to engage in demonstrations against the monarchy or to defend the existing regime.

League of Nations.—The date of the future world-disarmament conference was definitely fixed by the League Council for Tuesday, February 2, 1932. It was announced that it would meet in Geneva provided Geneva convinces the May session of the Council that it can assure adequate housing facilities. The appointment of a president or of a special commission to prepare for the conference was left open. Much talk in favor of an American president of the conference was rumored.

The Council closed its sessions with a strong rebuke to Poland, in compliance with the German representations, for maltreatment of the German minorities. The report adopted by the Council demanded that the Polish Government curb the activities of organizations which have been conducting a campaign of terrorism against Germans in Upper Silesia. The rebuke was reported as satisfying the Germans, while it was sufficiently diplomatic to be accepted by the Poles. It was understood that Poland agreed to remove the Governor of Upper Silesia.

Current press reports about Spain are not only unreliable but are sometimes grotesque. So, too, have been the verdicts of English-writing historians on Spain. M. R. Madden deals with the *leyenda negra* in her article, "Spain and the New Propaganda," to be published next week.

Norbert Engels, in a delightful sketch from life, "Good Cigars," describes the attitudes of some Belgian settlers towards "the cigar, the priest, and the farm problem."

Many may judge Ward Clarke as uncharitable in his "Why Apologize?" But still, he might retort to them: why apologize?

Another query, "Why Laugh at the Senate?" is answered with a "don't" by Anthony J. Beck.

The King's Visit

Economic Crisis

Martial Law Lifted

Date for Conference

Rebuke to Poland

Industry and Agriculture

AMERICA

A - CATHOLIC - REVIEW - OF - THE - WEEK

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1931

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

WILFRID PARSONS
Editor-in-Chief

PAUL L. BLAKELY
JOHN LAFARGE

FRANCIS X. TALBOT
CHARLES I. DOYLE
Associate Editors

WILLIAM I. LONERGAN
JAMES A. GREELEY

FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:

Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
Telephone: Medallion 3-3082

Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts

The Teaching Doctor

ONCE upon a time, the term "doctor" meant a man who knew his subject so thoroughly that he could teach it to others. Today the doctor of philosophy is one who has proved his ability to open a new field of knowledge, or to add to our knowledge of some subject already familiar. He may be the world's poorest teacher, but he has pursued the Homeric *gar* to its remotest lairs, and he knows exactly how many books Shakespeare bought, and how many he borrowed. But he does not know, necessarily, why the world loves Homer or Shakespeare. To him they may not be poets, but only mines from which a Ph.D. may be digged.

It would seem to follow that a doctor of philosophy should be a fellow sadly out of place in any college. Not a few colleges have made that discovery after sad experience. As Dr. Samuel M. Shoemaker said, in the *New York Times* for January 26, "I have known men myself who have been advanced on college faculties, who are perfect duds as teachers, and either distinctly bad influences over the students, or else do not care to be bothered with them." Dr. Shoemaker fears that men of this kind are not helping the college to give the student what the student has every right to demand. Instead of teaching young men "to know and love some branch of learning," they spend their time with admirable assiduity on work calculated "to increase their academic reputation for research."

Perhaps the fundamental trouble is that we demand from every doctor of philosophy what not all of them can give. The principle that no man should be permitted to teach a subject which he has not thoroughly mastered is sound, and on this point no compromise should be permitted. But the doctor may be as wise as Newton in scientific lore, and utterly lack the gifts which fit him to be a teacher of young men and women. In that case it is worse than sheer waste to demand that he teach. Let him continue to peer through a test tube, or hang over a seismograph, or search out old manuscripts, and some day he may give us results for which the whole world will be

richer. Van Leeuwenhoek was a research man of the first order, but as a teacher he probably would have failed, and it was probably his awareness of this fact which made him refuse to take pupils. "I have never had any desire to teach," he wrote Leibnitz. On a modern faculty, some teaching would have been required.

Undoubtedly, the mere fact that a faculty member has received the doctorate in philosophy from a reputable institution does not argue want of the teacher's gift. On the other hand, the degree is no guarantee that he can *teach*. But his learning can be put to many academic uses; if he cannot teach, he may engage profitably in research; should he feel this line closed to him, his technical knowledge may make him most valuable as the head of a department, or in some administrative capacity.

Yet, the chief care of every college should be competent teachers, and for teachers doctors are poor substitutes. The college which thinks that by enlisting the number of doctors demanded by our standardizing agencies, it ends its troubles, has only begun them. In Dr. Shoemaker's phrase, everyone of them may be a "dud" in the classroom. The doctor has his uses, but the doctor who can teach is beyond all price.

An Unacceptable Amendment

THE recommendation of the Wickersham Commission which appeared to win a majority approval of the Commission itself, and has been most widely discussed, was prepared by Henry W. Anderson. The text is printed on page 434 of this issue. The amendment would give Congress power to (1) continue the present system of absolute national Prohibition, (2) remit the matter in whole or in part to the States, (3) adopt any system of effective control.

Any change from the present system would be an improvement. But, with all deference to Mr. Anderson, we suggest that his amendment does not destroy the root evil.

That evil, in our judgment, is Federal control.

It is all but generally admitted that Congress should never have been given the power inherent in the Eighteenth Amendment. But, in Mr. Anderson's plan, that power remains in its integrity. Under it, Congress could authorize a system which, like the present, satisfies no one but bootleggers and fanatics; or a system which would satisfy the brewers, the distillers, and the politicians, but not men and women whose first interest is the preservation of sane constitutional government. What system would prevail, would be decided by a partisan controlled Congress.

Could a better method of putting the problem of liquor control into partisan politics possibly be contrived?

Candidates would be assessed not for their ability or patriotism, but on this ground only, "Do you favor a wide-open country, or nation-wide prohibition?" Federal judges and other officials would be appointed on the same basis, only to be hampered, or dismissed from office, by the incoming wet or dry Administration. We should have confusion worse confounded.

No Amendment which predicates Federal control can

be acceptable. The sole remedy for the fearful evils of Prohibition is repeal of the Amendment. In the meantime, let appropriations for enforcement be pared to the bone.

February 12, 1809

ON that day a man was born, peer of any given his country by the Almighty. A frontier mother, Nancy Hanks, "who gave us Lincoln, and never knew," holds him to her bosom, and in the long nights, as the winds drift the snows around the cabin, she dreams the dreams that every mother dreams. But the glory and the tragedy alike are withheld from her. Hers is the humble task to care for her husband and her children, teaching them to love one another, and God above all.

Nine hundred miles and more lie between the beautiful country on the south fork of Nolin creek, in Kentucky, and the city of Washington. A bridge of fifty-two years stretches from that frosty February morning in 1809 to March, 1861, when this child of Kentucky, who grew to young manhood in Indiana, and to maturity on the plains of Illinois, came to Washington, to be chief executive of a people on the brink of war.

From his window he could gaze through the April trees across the Potomac, where a new flag, devised by Americans like himself, was flying. Now lifted in the soft sunlight by the Southern breeze, it would soon be lifted on bloody fields of battle, above men fighting for their independence, as their fathers did, and Lincoln's, from 1776 to 1783.

It was all a puzzle, thought this gaunt backwoods lawyer from Illinois. Who could search the mind of the Almighty? Who could foresee His designs upon men and nations?

Meanwhile, there was no profit in worrying whether or not the Lord was marshalled on his side. A man's first job was to try to range himself on the Lord's side. If only this matter of Sumter—well, his duty was to do the best he could, according to the light given him. The Lord, he reckoned, would take care of the rest.

It was a puzzle, this matter of government, in 1861. It is a puzzle seventy years later. But today the puzzle is more wearying, for we have no Lincoln, but only sutlers seeking fat jobs in the quartermaster's department. Despite Declarations and Constitutions, no government is better than the men who administer it. Once our political institutions bred men. Now they breed office-seekers and money-grubbers.

Sometimes it would appear that what Lincoln considered government, and what government is in fact today, differ as widely as the Lincoln cabin in 1809 and a Ritz-Carlton ballroom in 1931. One was human and humble. The other is gaudy and artificial. We seem to prefer the latter. In all but money we are poorer than Lincoln and his countrymen a century ago.

God send us, then, mothers like Nancy Hanks! She could read only with difficulty; perhaps she could not write. But she could teach lessons that made a Lincoln. Without mothers such as she was, never can we have sons and men such as Lincoln was. "God bless my mother,"

he said, in a moment when the consciousness of his work was beginning to dawn upon him. "All that I am, all that I hope to be, I owe to my mother."

The souls of Abraham Lincoln and of Nancy Hanks have returned to their Creator, and their bodies lie in the dust. May her sweet and gentle memory hearten and uplift all mothers. May his wise and magnanimous spirit, that knew malice for none but charity for all, once more walk abroad, and summon us to a new dedication to the principles for which he lived and labored.

Usury and House Rent

WE have frequently drawn attention to the supreme importance of the housing problem. A few years ago, the stress was laid, very properly, on sanitary conditions, and legislation was devised to prohibit the construction of tenements which did not provide a minimum of light and air, and some protection against fire hazards. Today the emphasis has shifted. Retaining what has been gained, our present insistence should be for the provision of houses for persons of moderate means.

For the wealthy, no difficulty exists. They can always find refuge in Park Avenue palaces, or at some watering place, and for them every day marks the construction of new and more expensive apartments. The prices demanded appear to influence the whole market rate, so that the trade and business of building houses and renting them, have gone crazy. But there is method in the madness. The result sought and obtained is legalized usury.

Rental is nothing but interest on a loan. The investor may claim in justice a moderate return, the exact rate depending upon many circumstances. In case of conflict between what the investor and the renter consider to be a moderate rate, if the two parties cannot agree, the State must intervene.

At the present time every State forbids usury, and while this legislation is very commonly evaded, a maximum rate of interest is fixed by law. That is, I am under no legal obligation to lend money, but if I do lend it, the rate of interest which I may demand is limited. But if I lend a section of my rooming house, or of my tenement in the slums, I may demand any rate I choose. In one case, usury is forbidden, and in the other permitted.

Here and there, it is true, an effort has been made to provide readily accessible remedies at law, but in practice, these have not been found of great value. Too many bales of tape must be cut through before they can be reached. In these, as in other social devices, a complaining individual has small chance when he must deal with the legal battery of a corporation. To make matters worse, even when housing conditions are so bad as to constitute a menace to health, it often happens that the renter can obtain no redress at law. Thus he is forced to pay usury on the loan of rooms that injure his health, and may sow the seeds of disease in the bodies of his little children.

We are heartily in sympathy with the New York State Housing Board which demands that regulations necessary for health and safety be enforced "without regard to the

effects of enforcement on property rights." No man has any conceivable right to use his goods to the detriment of his fellows. Should he insist upon abusing the property of which he is, in the sight of God, the steward, then the State may and should deprive him of that property. For the State is obliged to protect the individual in those instances in which he cannot possibly protect himself. Further, as Leo XIII teaches, a special obligation lies upon the State to protect the wage earner and others who, by reason of their scanty means are more exposed to the greed and rapacity of predacious wealth.

But as there is no hope whatever that any State will take such action, it seems wiser at the present time to **attack the evil of usurious rent indirectly.**

The State should enact legislation which will induce individuals and private societies to provide housing for the citizen of small and moderate earnings. A beginning has been made under the provisions of New York's new housing law, and, on the houses thus far erected, the Board reports that the principal invested is secure, and the return adequate. That this report is not too optimistic is indicated by the fact that only a few days ago, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company advanced \$1,300,000 for a group of eight six-story dwellings in the Bronx section, New York, with accommodations for 474 families, at a rental of \$11 per room. It is to be hoped that other large holders of capital may find the scheme sufficiently inviting, and by erecting dwelling houses meet a grave social need at the same time that they secure a reasonable return upon their investments.

Charity or Philanthropy?

CHARITY, it has been said, is at once the sweetest and the bitterest word in the language. The author of that statement was no philologist, for charity means love, and he had forgotten what Our Lord teaches about this greatest of virtues. Fundamentally, charity is love of God, the first commandment of the law. Like unto it is the law which bids us love all men, for the sake of our Father in Heaven.

Unfortunately, under the influence of the religious revolt which began in the sixteenth century, charity took on the implication of a mediant as the recipient, and of a satisfied Lady Bountiful as the giver. In the country it meant flannels for granny, supplied by the vicar's wife, with an occasional basket from the lord and lady of the manor. In the trading and manufacturing districts, it operated through doles and poor laws, and other expedients and evasions, for justice not sustained by genuine charity, does not long remain justice. To receive, lowered self-respect, but to give was proper to the ruling classes, just as ruffs were, and velvet and lace, and starched linen. Once love of God and of God's children, it had become a social usage, which both marked the exclusiveness of the alleged upper classes, and ministered to their sense of superiority to Lazarus among the kindly dogs.

We have plenty of that sort of charity in this country. It may be that in public and as a people, we have no other kind. Our gifts must be registered; more, they must be entrusted to some society or other which, with a statisti-

cal charity from which every vestige of the supernatural has been removed, will distribute them. Charity, which is love of God, must be replaced, officially, by philanthropy, which is love of man. In turn, love of man soon comes to mean this: that we minister to human suffering, and supply for human needs, because the sick and suffering imperil the economic good, and are brakes upon the wheels of social progress.

The sick can communicate their disease, and the poor are not paying customers. Therefore we must heal the stricken, and bring the poor forthwith back to a condition in which they can function as producing units—that is, work fifty-four hours per week—and become profitable consumers of our surplus crops, manufacturers, and imports.

It is a dull drab charity, this; as dull and drab as a universe without God.

Christianizing the Red Cross

MANY who listened as the Red Cross spoke its appeal for funds over a nation-wide network of stations a few weeks ago, perceived a similar dullness in all the speeches, but one.

In the addresses, beginning with Mary Pickford, and ranging through Judge Payne, President Hoover, former President Coolidge, Mrs. Belmont, and Amos 'n' Andy, to Will Rogers, one sensed the absence of a note that should have been dominant. Describing human suffering, extending over the vast area of twenty-one States, suffering which may yet result in the stunting or early demise of thousands of children, not one speaker voiced an appeal in the name of a pitying Father in Heaven, or in that of His Son, the lover of little children. Presidents have, on occasion, implored the gracious assistance of Almighty God, and in the name of the people have admitted our dependence upon Him. One wonders why that assistance was not invoked when an appeal by word of mouth was made to 120,000,000 Americans.

Let the single exception among these speeches be noted with the honor which it merits. Introduced as "that great, warm-hearted lover of his fellow men," former Governor Alfred E. Smith alone begged his hearers to contribute to the utmost of their ability to relieve their fellow citizens in distress, "so that we may bring down upon ourselves the blessings and graces of Divine Providence." Hearing these words, thousands of listeners at once realized that at last the proper note was sounded. Had they not been uttered, the conclusion might have been reached that we had come to a stage of unbelief, in which it was no longer proper for public men publicly to avow their belief in Divine Providence.

While we express the opinion that an association which as its symbol claims the cross, would not be harmed, but greatly benefitted, by more of the spirit of Him Who for our sins was immolated upon the Cross, we wish the Red Cross all success in the work of relieving the stricken in the drought districts. It made a good beginning when it declined to play politics with Congress in its futile plan of relieving suffering of all kinds in the forty-eight States by the application of a \$25,000,000 Federal poultice.

Origin of the Birth-Control Idea

G. C. HESELTINE

I DO not know when or how it came about that men were said to have bees in their bonnets; you will probably find it in a dictionary of quotations or proverbs. But if you want first-class examples of such men you will not find better than the Social Reformers, Political Economists or "Philosophers" of the early nineteenth century. Sydney Smith wrote of one of them: "Philosopher Malthus came here last week. I got an agreeable party for him of unmarried people. There was only one lady who had had a child; but he is a good-natured man, and, if there are no appearances of approaching fertility, is civil to every lady."

Malthus had a Great Idea—just one. He saw large numbers of poverty-stricken and unhappy people herded in slums round the newly built factories. He hated misery and vice—and, of course, vice inevitably went with poverty. Contemplating the dreary scene he was moved to effect a remedy. So many people and so much misery and vice! The remedy? Why, of course, less people, less misery and vice! This idea had the vast simplicity of all the great ideas in history, like the wheel, the lever, the steam engine, gravity, usury, bribery and slavery.

Parson Malthus loved the human race, but he thought it would be more lovable if there were less of it. He had the characteristic eighteenth-century parson's detestation of poverty; perhaps he did not detest even the poor quite so much as their poverty. He held that they were wrong to seek to improve their condition by demanding better treatment from their employers, and forming trade unions to secure that end. Their poverty was their own greatest crime because the remedy lay with themselves. It was their own fault for being there at all. If there were less of them the employers would be at the disadvantage by the law of supply and demand. Industry provided a certain amount of surplus (over the cost of production) available for wages, said the philosopher. The fewer laborers the more to share between them. Result: prosperity all round.

It was the theory of Malthus that the population always tended to outstrip the means of subsistence and that the human race was neither ingenious enough nor active enough to increase its means of subsistence in adequate proportion. How he knew this for an incontestable fact, he never told us. He produced statistics about Sweden and America that would make even the modern economist blush for his kind. From his premises he deduced that limitation of population was the only alternative means of securing that there should always be enough of everything to go round. And if everybody had enough of everything, there would be no poor—and no poor, no misery and vice. You may not like his reasoning but there it is.

Being a religious and God-fearing man, in fact, a parson by profession, he felt bound to ensure that any means he might suggest for limiting the population would be

in keeping with his religious principles. He suggested, or rather insisted upon, delayed marriages and strict continency or chastity in the unmarried. If people married later, they would have fewer children, if only because of the limitation of time. Poor Malthus has been blamed for the teachings of the Neo-Malthusians, just as Darwin for the Neo-Darwinians, and Plato for the Neo-Platonists. God knows he lacked moral principles, for he lived in an age and society which had long forgotten the nature of morals or the meaning of a principle, though the words *moral principles* were never more often or more piously uttered.

One of the men of his age, Godwin, who sponged on the poet Shelley and saddled him with his daughter, disagreed violently with Malthus. They joined battle furiously, on paper. Into this fight came Francis Place, a better man than either, and got the worst of it. In the long run he got the best of it for his views are still being urged vigorously, though he is forgotten. They are more pernicious and odious than those of Malthus or Godwin. Place supplied a little more than a solution of economic difficulties. That little more is of very much greater practical moment and value to an unmoral generation. He certainly did not intend it to be so. But there it is. What he really cared for in his teachings nobody cares for now. Nobody cares a fig for his Big Idea, but very many care far too much for his little tip.

Place was born and bred in extreme poverty and considerable misery. By hard work, diligence and all that, he became prosperous. His life, in this respect, was a typical Sunday-school example of virtue rewarded. But he was a sincere and honest philanthropist. He was mindful of his early sufferings and sensitive to the sufferings of others. He knew the cause of those sufferings:

Will they [the poor] believe, merely because they are told so, that these barbarous laws [factory and poor laws], savage denunciations, cruel sentences, and conspiracies to degrade and pauperize them, are anything but wanton outrages of power; and ought any man to expect they will be operated upon by those whom they have but too much reason to believe are their decided enemies, whenever their pride, their ignorance, and love of power, induce them to suppose they have an interest in doing them mischief? Do they not know, that the whole practice of the Government, in respect to them, has been, and still is, an attempt to keep down the wages of labour? Do they not know that this has all along been recommended to the Government by the Gentry, the Magistrates and the great Manufacturers? Do they not know that it has been the intention of all above them to reduce them to the most abject state of dependence?

You will gather, good reader, that Place's answer is "*They do!*" We may now see for ourselves to what an abject state of dependence the working classes have been reduced. Place, casting about for a remedy, found Malthus. Restrict your labor and bargain with it. But since labor may be forced by law if you attempt to bargain with it, as was done in the fourteenth century and is done in the twentieth, you must restrict the available labor by

restricting the population. If you breed too freely, says Place, you are a traitor to your fellows by cheapening their labor. It is the worst crime you can commit. Place saw the impracticability (in the given conditions) of the Malthusian policy of restraint; he also saw the futility of Gaffer Godwin. So he accepted Malthus' thesis, and received with it all the reflected public odium of Malthus. But he had to go further, and he went one worse. He proposed the logical and practical means of restricting population: contraception. And so eventually did contraception become in his mind the great cure-all. He urges it as the remedy for every social, industrial and moral evil, on every possible occasion. Logically, on his premises, he is right. Philosophically, on sound premises, and morally, on natural and spiritual grounds, he is hopelessly and disgustingly wrong.

Malthus propounded his theory and supported it by statistics (which can be made to support anything), that economic distress and all consequent miseries and vices (and many others besides) were due to over-population. He thought that the suffering poor and ignorant had only to be shown his theory and figures to believe it. Place built upon his folly. The modern sociologist tries to sell us the superstructure.

The doctrines of Malthus and Place have not only the character of the cure-all, they have also the distinctive mark of all evil sociology and legislation. They have as their only basis expediency.

Of course, there is always something in it! But it is by claiming that there is everything in it, which is a lie, that their successors gain the ears of the public. There was something in Malthus' idea that too many poor men needing food made labor cheap. But there was nothing in the idea that the poverty was the cause of misery and vice in the poor. The poverty of the poor was not a cause at all, but an *effect* of vice in the rich.

Place was much more nearly right when he said that the poor were deliberately and systematically reduced to the most abject state of dependence! But neither, given even partially sound premises, had the clear-mindedness or the logic or the moral sanity, much less the knowledge of human nature, to enable them to reach a just and wise conclusion. Purity of intention makes no difference in this matter. Place was probably a sincere man and may have been moved by true charity, Malthus was much more likely selfish in his motive—he cared less for improving the human race and more for making it like the best people such as himself. Yet Place came to a worse conclusion than Malthus. It was so with all the reformers who lacked an ethical basis for their politics. The bee in their bonnet frequently buzzed so furiously that it drowned the still small voice of conscience, as in Godwin's case. Yet Godwin was right when he said that it was nonsense to talk about not being able to support a population until we had tried. But whatever the theories of the philosophers lacked, they never lacked expediency.

As economic and social difficulties became monstrous and threatening, with the establishment of the industrial factories and the mass-exploitation of the labor of the working classes, expedients had to be devised for avoid-

ing serious trouble. Legislation was both corrective and preventive. Later the legislators had to be content to get over the immediate difficulty, gradually they have to be content to do less and they are glad to postpone the trouble even a little while. The concern now is to alleviate unemployment, to keep businesses from winding-up. Through all this stalks the specter of expediency. The question is: will this law or this practice get us out of our immediate difficulty? It is not asked whether it will do so justly or morally, or with honor and dignity.

Greater philosophers than Malthus or Place have held that justice, morality, honor and dignity are proper to all good human actions and the basis of permanent human achievement, and that expediency or anything else which is given precedence of them is improper and cannot endure. The doctrines of Malthus and Place were rotten with expediency.

Neither saw that, if people could limit their numbers of children to very few for the sake of a measure of economic comfort, they could do without them altogether for the sake of a little more. If they were so blind to the obvious extensions of their own arguments we can hardly blame them if they were blind to the moral aspects of the matter. They lived, as we do, in a black fog of expediency. It is written that it was expedient that a Man should die for the people.

Keeping Pace with Time

J. PAUL GLASS

THERE has been considerable agitation for some years for a revision of the calendar which will afford something near an equalization of the monthly divisions of the year and a smoother operation of modern social and business machinery. The mechanism of the heavens has never moved with the exactitude of man-made instruments. When man constructs a machine, every wheel, lever and connection is synchronized to operate in a mathematical and precise relation to every other part. Even when irregular and eccentric action is desired, there is a regularity of movement which brings every operation into a fixed relation to every other operation—an established regularity in the entire system—producing a rhythmic repetition in the process as a whole.

Not so with the stellar and planetary motions. Simple, complex and compound fractions abound to a degree which taxes the ingenuity of man when he attempts to regulate and systematize them. The calendar furnishes a familiar example in a small way of the problems which confront the astronomer in his endeavors to systematize the machinery of the heavens.

The annual period of revolution, 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, 45.51 seconds, defies any equalized subdivision. This problem has challenged the ingenuity of savants since history began. Calendars have been devised, revised, discarded. Space does not permit, nor is it the writer's purpose, to discuss these at length. We will briefly mention the two most important ones.

The Jewish calendar consisted of twelve months of twenty-nine and thirty days. These twelve months cov-

ered 354 days. This caused a discrepancy of from eleven to twelve days between the lunar and the solar year, which was provided for by an intercalary month. This arrangement, crude as it was, was probably as good as any in use until 46 B.C., when Julius Caesar introduced the Julian calendar. This calendar, with certain revisions, is practically the same as ours of today. It was based on a solar year of $365\frac{1}{4}$ days, the fraction of a day being provided for by the addition of one day every fourth year, known to us as leap year. This calendar made the year about eleven minutes too long, which was, of course, far better than being eleven days too short. This difference of eleven minutes has practically been taken care of by dropping out one leap year three times in every 400 years. That is, when the closing year of the century is divisible by 400 it is a leap year, otherwise not. For example, the year 1900 was not a leap year, and there was no leap year from 1896 to 1904. Should the present calendar be continued that long, the year 2000 will be leap year.

The movement for calendar revision has reached a point where the matter has become a subject for consideration with the League of Nations. Not that the League has any authority to establish a calendar, but being the most important international organization in the world today, it has been entrusted with the matter in an advisory capacity, operating in conjunction with the International Chamber of Commerce. The matter is being handled here by the National Committee on Calendar Simplification at Rochester, N. Y. It may be timely, therefore, to consider some of the suggestions which have been presented in this connection. Nearly one hundred forms for the proposed calendar have been offered, most of which have been rejected as not practical. Those which have found favor fall naturally into two classes, which may be designated the twelve-month and the thirteen-month forms. One of these two will almost certainly be offered for the world's approval.

One of these twelve-month plans, known as the "Swiss Plan," on the basis that a year consists of fifty-two weeks and one day, proposes to dispose of the extra day by making it January 0. This day would not belong to any week, but would merely be January 0. The next day would be Monday, January 1. Thus the year would always begin on Monday and end on Sunday, January 0 coming between Sunday, December 30, and Monday, January 1. By this arrangement the same day of the month would fall on the same day of the week every year, thus eliminating the certain degree of confusion on this point which now exists and rendering unnecessary a new and different calendar each year. The additional day for leap year would be placed immediately after June 31 and designated as July 0, or made a midsummer holiday and given a distinctive name as such, but would not belong to any week. Both June 31 and July 1 would fall on the same week day in leap year as in other years. Another advantage claimed for this plan is that the year could be divided into exact quarters, each containing the same number of days and weeks. This would be accomplished by having each quarter consist of two thirty-day

and one thirty-one-day months—ninety-one days in all—this division being a desirable factor in the transaction of business based on quarterly settlements, etc.

The advocates of the thirteen-month year, which has been termed the "International Fixed Calendar," or the "Equal Month Calendar," raises the point that if the years are to be equalized, why not also the months? They propose thirteen months of four weeks each, thus filling out the quota of 364 days, with the added advantage that each year, each month and each week will begin on Sunday and end on Saturday. As in the twelve-month plan, the extra day could be placed at January 0, and leap-year day at July 0. One suggests that the 365th day instead of being January 0 shall be called New Year Day and the Leap Year Day be placed at the end of the year and called Old Year Day. This, in leap years, would bring the two intercalary days together, between Saturday of one week and Sunday of the next. This writer goes further with a proposition that Christmas, which would naturally fall on the twenty-fifth day of the thirteenth month, be the beginning of a period known as the "Holidays," which will continue to and include Sunday, January 1.

The summing up of all this seems to point to a growing desire for some sort of calendar revision, which has not yet reached the proportions of a demand, but which is sufficiently strong to assure the attention of the public once it is fairly and formally presented. Before that time arrives it may be well to ask if we really need calendar revision, and if so, whether any of the proposed forms will meet the need.

The writer finds in all the plans thus far presented two weak points which seem to have escaped notice. The first is a fallacy in the so-called "equalization" of months and quarters. The fact is that 365 or 366 days emphatically, absolutely and firmly refuse to be divided by 4, 12, 52 or 7, and no amount of zero dates, undated intercalaries or other devices will alter this fact. The proper way to meet a difficulty is certainly not to ignore it. Such a course never accomplishes anything except to increase and multiply our troubles. If we say that the first quarter contains ninety-one days, just because we have decided to call the first day of the year January 0, we deceive ourselves to no purpose. The extra day is there. We cannot escape it. It must be accounted for. It must be lived. The tenant who rents by the month occupies his premises thirty-one days and not thirty days, whether he and his landlord see fit to admit the fact or not. If he rents by the quarter he occupies the premises ninety-two days and not ninety-one. The same is true of the third quarter in leap years. If we attempt to ignore the zero days, pretending that they do not exist, by giving them a zero date or otherwise, we are in the same situation as the man who thinks to evade his creditors by refusing to open his mail on the first day of the month, or the ostrich which thrusts his head in the sand. Facts are indeed stubborn things and it is unmanly, unreasonable and unavailing to try to escape them by ignoring them. Let us therefore not try to make ourselves believe that by juggling figures we can perform a miracle in mathe-

matics. Let us face these extra days, acknowledge them and use them.

But a greater and even more important obstacle in the way of any of the proposed forms for the new calendar exists in the attempt to break the established sequence of the seven-day week. Placing one or more intercalaries between Saturday and Sunday, or between any other two days, does break this sequence, and this is something which, in the humble opinion of the writer, the nations will never accept. The seven-day week is a time-honored institution, reaching back beyond the dawn of history, having in a general sense a religious significance to most people, and so deeply rooted in the lives and prejudices of all peoples that no international body will ever be able to tear it out. Whatever the shade of denominational, national or racial faith, whether the day of rest and worship be Friday, Saturday or Sunday, the unbroken sequence of the seven-day week will be insisted upon by civilized nations, of whatever belief or race. No matter when, how, or why the seven-day week was established, it has taken such a hold upon the world that no power can shake it from its bearings. It has been tried. France tried it at the time of the Revolution, but the ten-day week was never recognized by the nations and it soon gave place to the old order. So here is, we believe, the supreme and insurmountable obstacle in the path of all the forms so far presented for calendar revision. If re-

vision is to become an accomplished fact, it must be done without zero days and without interrupting the continuity of the seven-day week.

The fact remains that our present calendar displays room for improvement in the matter of equalizing the months. The haphazard arrangement of twenty-eight, twenty-nine, thirty and thirty-one day months clearly demands betterment. But it can be done without zero dates or undated holidays. Suppose we begin the year with a January of thirty days. Then February with thirty-one days, alternating in this manner for the first eleven months and finish with thirty days for December. This will fill out the 365 days with a practical alternation of thirty and thirty-one day months, the only break then being at the end of the year, when we shall have two thirty-day months, November and December, coming together. Then in leap year, give December thirty-one days, and we have an ideal year. So the months glide by in rhythmical cadence, like the wheels of a Pullman train over the rails, for eleven months, or, when leap year occurs, for twenty-three months in unbroken succession; 30-31; 30-31; 30-31; click-click; click-click; click; then a short rail joint for December, scarcely disturbing the rhythm, and the chariot of time rolls on over the road bed of the ages, 30-31; 30-31; 30-31; click-click, click-click; click-click.

Time is complicated, isn't it? I think so.

All of a Monday Morning

WILLIAM I. LONERGAN, S.J.

IT is Monday morning and I have just finished glancing at the *New York Times* and the *Herald Tribune*.

Always, on Monday, I find these papers particularly intriguing. They generally devote considerable space to a report of some of the outstanding pulpit utterances of the previous Sunday and it seems to me that nothing so indicates contemporary religious aberrations as many of these preachments. Only too often they remind one of Christ's parable of the blind leading the blind, while in the light of most of them it is not hard to see why our Main Street is so religiously colorless, or why Mr. Jack Averageman or Mrs. Percival Goldcoast lead such un-Christian lives.

Today's papers were especially interesting. Along with the *World*, both the *Times* and the *Herald Tribune* carried on their front page a lengthy Associated Press dispatch about the Papal Encyclical on marriage. Like every tolerably well-instructed Catholic, I anticipated that the Pope's letter was not going to teach any new doctrine about Matrimony or even anything new of a disciplinary character. In the realm of dogma the Church could not give the world anything new, and the necessity of new disciplinary legislation was pretty adequately forestalled and obviated by the promulgation of the Code of Canon Law some years ago.

The news value of the dispatch consisted chiefly in the fact that it was the Pope who was speaking and that he

was fearlessly proclaiming before a world that would probably brand his utterances as radically reactionary that there was but one law of Christ and His Church about marriage, and that it applied to king and peasant alike, to the twentieth as well as to the first century. It was also another bomb thrown among non-Catholic leaders who have been relaxing more and more their opposition to anything that might militate against the sacredness of domestic society. The moral limit, one might say, was reached when the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal and Anglican churches assembled at Lambeth last July, gave their sanction to limited contraceptive practices, so far misleading even many devout Catholics as to the teaching of the Church in the matter that His Eminence Cardinal Bourne felt forced at the time to warn the Faithful of the danger.

What chiefly interested me this Monday morning were the sermon pages, their content as well as their make-up. Both the *Times* and the *Herald Tribune* devoted more than 125 inches of space to reporting sermons, the former covering twenty-eight and the latter seventeen preachers. I take it that Manhattan and the Bronx, not to mention the other three boroughs that make up New York City, contain at least 200 Catholic churches, and that in the metropolitan area which these two papers serve there are considerably over a million Catholics. Yet in neither newspaper was a single Catholic pulpit utterance recorded.

Perhaps there were no sermons in our churches yesterday. Perhaps our priests did not say anything of religious or moral interest or value. However, the absence of reports of Catholic sermons only dawned on me after I had finished my reading. At the time I was more concerned with what the preachers who did get attention had to say.

First of all, a double-column headline called attention to an assault by a Protestant Episcopal minister on Baptism. Though among his own confreres he is known as a radical thinker, nevertheless his words read rather startlingly and, in view of his bishop's valiant attempt a few weeks before to defend the Sacrament of Marriage, against Judge Lindsay's companionate theories, incongruously. Dr. Guthrie was quoted as saying:

Baptism as we have it now is corrupted for us by the pessimism which came into Christianity from India and Persia as a result of the disorganization in the spiritual and moral life by the establishment of the Roman Empire. The doctrine to redeem us from corruption was sought and came to be the doctrine of total depravity of human nature because of the sin of Adam and the possibility of canceling it through the magical atoning work of Jesus. This is the conception which the Catholic Church handed on to Protestantism. It did not come from Jesus Himself. . . . To Jesus Baptism contained the symbolism of the cleansing power of water and the symbolism of the River Jordan. . . .

While I am still puzzling over the obscurity of some of the remarks, their general trend is sufficiently clear. It is easy to recognize in them the Modernist doctrines about Genesis and the creation story and the supernatural order and the fall of Adam and Eve, carried to their logical consequences. However, the statements are so dogmatically and historically inaccurate and so grossly misrepresentative of the traditional teaching even of the speaker's own communion, that one wonders they could be uttered with impunity. I cannot but ask myself whether Episcopalianism has finally thrown overboard its belief in Baptism, whether it has any authentic or official teaching on the subject, whether there is any ecclesiastical power to safeguard the purity of its pulpit utterances. The newspaper tells us:

Dr. Guthrie said people today did not believe in the doctrine of Baptism as based upon the fall and original sin, while many abhorred it. "Now we are not born of sin," Dr. Guthrie continued. "The sexual life is not under the curse of God. . . . Marriage, in itself, is holy. It is not as the Church has taught, some kind of inadequate substitute for virginity."

So far as fairly wide theological reading serves me correctly, neither Catholics nor the Oriental Church nor Protestants have taught that man is born "of sin," that sexual life is "under the curse of God," that marriage is unholy or some "inadequate substitute for virginity." I have learned very much from even a brief extract of Dr. Guthrie's sermon. But certainly it all seems out of harmony with the recognized and accepted Creeds of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Thirty-nine Articles!

Even more significant than the pulpit utterance just referred to was the following excerpt, also in today's paper, from a sermon delivered yesterday in one of the most "Catholic" of New York's non-Catholic churches. The speaker, an Anglican Religious, is thus quoted:

Just as no part of the Christian Church exhibits complete holi-

ness, similarly no part of the Church is perfectly catholic. The Church of Rome, for instance, claims a great deal. It points to its widespread influence in all parts of the world. But the Church of Rome is and always has been predominantly Italian. All of us know that there is very little hope for anyone, except an Italian, to be elected head of that Church.

In this respect it fails. And it also fails to accept and consecrate to Christ any of the truths discovered by modern science which rightfully should be associated with Him and of necessity form part of His Church. Thus its outlook becomes increasingly narrow. . . .

The Catholic Church is a body—not an organization—in which all men are equal in that they are necessary to the life of that body. . . . The Church has to receive all the truths of modern science and incorporate them into the truths which it has inherited from Jesus. . . .

Once more I was startled as I read. I had assumed that it was a tenet with my Anglo-Catholic friends that Christ's Church was *de facto* Catholic and holy; that both its catholicity and its holiness were marks of its Divine origin; and that Christ had also endowed it with indefectibility. Here I find myself being taught that no Church is catholic or holy, and implicitly that Christ's promise to Peter has failed,—His Church has failed!

As I pondered I understood better why it was that the distinguished novelist, Sheila Kaye-Smith, explained the beginning of her conversion by the recognition that Anglicanism lacked holiness while she found it in Rome. Not that every Catholic is holy—that is not the purport of the "mark." But the Church itself is holy, has within her the means of sanctifying her members, and actually does produce great saints, their holiness attested by miracles. I understood better, too, why Dr. Selden P. Delany, lately converted and formerly rector in the church where the sermon I have just quoted was delivered, was so dissatisfied with the absence of the real earmarks of the true Church in Anglicanism and Episcopalianism.

There have, in the centuries, been many serious arguments raised by Protestant controversialists against the catholicity of the Church but never anything so puerile as the charge that its Pope is generally an Italian. Obviously the preacher forgot that the Pope is Pope precisely because he is Bishop of Rome, and that it is as logical for the Romans to have one of their nationality presiding over them as it is for the people of the various dioceses in the United States to have Americans as their Ordinaries. As a fact, however, as Sovereign of the Vatican State, the Holy Father has lost his Italian citizenship. One strongly suspects that, not unlike a good many others who rail against an Italian Papacy, the speaker would be one of the first, were an American Cardinal chosen Supreme Pontiff tomorrow, to complain that the selection would imply renunciation of American citizenship.

Our preacher loosely charges that the Church refuses to recognize "any of the" scientific "truths." No special truth is noted which the Catholic Church rejects, for there is no scientific "fact" or "truth" that Rome declines to accept. She does refuse to fall in with the philosophizing of pseudo-scientists. Perhaps the speaker wished to infer that in not accepting and blessing and "consecrating to Christ" birth-control practices as the

late Lambeth Conference did, Rome was a scientific reactionary!

The congregation was further told that the Church is "not an organization." The Church is both the Mystical Body of Christ and, by Divine institution, a visible organization with a definite constitution and form of government. Heretofore I have always thought that it was the acceptance of this fact which in great measure accounted for the failure of the Anglican and Protestant Episcopal churches organically to unite with Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and others. I fear the preacher here overstepped himself. In his attempts to prove the falseness of the Catholic claims did he not prove too much—prove also the absence of Divinity in his own Church? One feels that very many Anglo-Catholics would resent the sermon's implications.

As I read and meditated, the truth was forced home of how chaotic and unsatisfying intellectually and spiritually Protestantism in all its forms is, even those which seem externally to approach nearest to Christ's true Church. Is it any wonder there is so much religious ignorance and agnosticism and doubt and misunderstanding and drifting among those outside the Catholic Church when their ministers preach the way they do? Could anything be more evident from such sermons (many of the others that I read were infinitely worse in their pronouncements and implications) than the need of authority in teaching? And where is that to be found except in Rome? The Encyclical reiterating age-old truths and reiterating them with authority and conviction proved that. Those who want their religion definite and authoritative have reason to be grateful to God that there is a Rome!

War Dangers in Europe

GERHARD HIRSCHFELD

III. The International Aspect

WHILE Europe is split by divergent economic forces and political ambitions; while slowly but steadily three large political groups are rounding into shape, France on one side, Russia on the other, and a new *Dreibund* linking Germany, Italy and Austria (also possibly Hungary) in the middle—out of the West there is rising a Power with great uniformity of purpose and credited with the aim of economic expansion: the United States. The fact that European private loans of American firms and corporations amount to something like \$4,000,000,000, not including, of course, War debts, Government loans and the like, shows clearly the extent to which Europe has come to rely upon the New World financially. By the same token, the fact that direct operations of American firms in Europe represent an outlay of some \$2,500,000,000, and that American interests now control more than 2,000 branch factories in foreign countries, employing in the neighborhood of 500,000 men (most of these branch plants being in Europe), may well show the significance of the European market to the United States.

As in the case of European nations whose policies show no well-balanced relation between their economic needs and the corresponding political expression, the United States lacks in its foreign-trade policy the same balance. If it wants to swamp the European market with manufactured goods such as automobiles, electrical appliances, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners and so forth, its policy follows economic considerations exclusively; there are no discussions between the commercial or industrial interests of the countries in Europe on one side and between the United States on the other. If European tariffs make the importation of American goods too expensive, there is not even an attempt made to straighten out the difficulties by means of reciprocal tariff concessions; instead, such handicaps are overcome by the establishment of branch

factories and assembly plants in foreign countries so that American surplus production may reach overseas markets in the cheapest possible way.

Naturally, this development has not taken place in Europe without more or less violent but ineffective protests on the part of the nations affected most, for instance, Germany, France, etc. While the tremendous power of the United States in finance, industry and commerce has in itself made such gestures of protest ridiculous, the prestige of the United States has not been sufficiently great to prevent the growth of a very distinct antagonism, and many predict the creation of a "United States of Europe" in the near future which in its tendency would be pointed directly and markedly against the United States, notwithstanding the asseverations to the contrary. However, the present confusion among European nations, the bitter fight of the major political parties for national policies and the neglect of economic trends, coupled with the age-old handicaps of tradition, of small jealousies and narrow-minded rivalries, will for some time prevent the formation of a "United States of Europe." And the United States of America will for some years be in a position to follow the high road leading to economic conquest of European markets.

The inevitable result of American "economic imperialism" will be shown in the increased pressure of economic forces in European countries. If the United States will and can sell more goods in Europe, the logical consequence is that European nations will have to ship more goods to foreign countries, including, if possible, the United States. The latter is trying to prevent the entry of European goods by tariffs which keep out rival manufactures. The leading industrial nations on the old continent, as we have seen in the first instalment of this series, face the absolute necessity of selling their goods in greater quantities and of finding ever-expanding markets. But not only have those markets failed to expand, but they are actually being restricted by tariff walls, by economic depression and so

on; on top of which comes the competition of foreign, i.e., American industries, on Europe's own home trade outlets.

If the German, French and Italian manufacturers turn to other overseas markets such as the countries of South America, they find that the consumption capacity of these nations has decreased and therefore their demand declined considerably. In Brazil, the price policy of the coffee producers has completely broken down; in Argentina, the meat, hide, and skin industries find their export business seriously hampered by the recently increased tariffs in the United States; in Venezuela, the oil industry feels the effect of world-wide over-production. And so it is with cotton in Peru, with tin in Bolivia, with sugar in Cuba, with nitrate in Chile, with cocoa in Colombia, and similarly down the line of all raw-material-producing countries in Latin America. If the South American farmer cannot sell his products at a reasonable price, neither can he buy from European manufacturers as much as he was accustomed to purchase in former years.

In Asia, again, there is a strong movement under way against importation of European goods; not only in India, where Gandhi has included in his program the boycott of any foreign product, nor in China, where the revolutionary movement has brought about a strong wave against foreign concessions, but also in Japan, where the rapid development of domestic industry has resulted in the same policies by means of which European nations are trying to protect their domestic manufacturing interests: tariffs and preferential commercial treaties. In Australia the same movement toward economic independence and industrial emancipation is reflected in recent developments. One of the best prospects among overseas markets is Africa, but this area is not sufficiently developed as yet to offer a really important outlet for European surplus production. So we find the problem of foreign marketing possibilities thrown back into the lap of the nations on the old continent: they will have to solve it by themselves and with their own means; or else it will not be solved at all.

This is, from a bird's eye view, the dilemma of Europe: The large nations—and lately the small ones, too—are following in their development tendencies which were true of the beginning of the twentieth century but no more so today. They are staking everything on strong and powerful productive units. It has been briefly outlined before how Germany, through American loans, was enabled to rebuild her plants and factories, her mines, farms and shops after the war; how the Balkan States, largely with French financial support, increased their agricultural production; how Russia in a concentrated effort strives for production and more production, with the admitted purpose of swamping the world market with goods and thereby overthrowing the capitalistic system; how France is anxiously developing her newly acquired mines and smelters in Alsace and Lorraine; how the nations of the British Empire are at present occupied with their own industrial development; and, finally, how the large-scale invasion of American industry into Europe

is adding to the enormous output of the combined European industries. If we put into this already strongly colored picture a few drops of South American over-production of sugar and coffee, of oil and cotton, of nitrate, tin, copper, etc. and add to this a teaspoonful of production rise in Japan, in China, in the Dutch East Indies, in the Philippines, in Australia—to mention only a few of the somewhat outlying production centers—we can quite clearly imagine the terrific force with which all these divergent economic trends in the end are bound to clash.

To conceive of production as a primary factor in these times of modern industrial evolution is a mistake, since quantity production, increased manufacturing efficiency, the "moving belt" and its attendant characteristics have multiplied production so that it stands today far above the number of sales possible. The American industry furnishes a good example: as Stuart Chase, the well-known economist, tells us, the automobile plants of this country could, in 1929, have turned out more than 8,000,000 new cars, yet only 6,300,000 were bought by the entire world. The production of oil today runs some forty-five per cent ahead of consumption. Approximately 900,000 pairs of shoes could be made in the United States each year, but only one third of this amount can be sold. And similar instances could be cited without end.

What has been done in the United States in the way of industrial development is now being duplicated in Europe. War clouds over the old continent have been formed by the smoke of factory chimneys, by the dust of mines and smelters, by the vapor of cultivated soil. Peoples are still proud of their industries, their agricultural strength, their strong merchant fleets and their tall and towering buildings. Yet the interdependence of nations, economically speaking, has no reflection in these same peoples' political views and opinions. Economic trends and economic difficulties find no direct expression in politics. The United States is very largely involved in the economic fate and future of Europe, yet this country has not been persuaded to give these economic responsibilities even the recognition expressed in membership in the World Court, let alone the League of Nations. As regards Europe, we have seen how the different nations, pressed by the *international* force of economic factors, turn exactly in the opposite direction, namely to strictly *nationally* limited policies. So came Germany to Fascism, Russia to Communism, France to Imperialism, and so will Great Britain probably come to a form of Protectionism.

Here we have the plight of Europe crystallized in two short phrases: as long as people are worrying only about ways and means of producing *more* and do not recognize that first they have to have a market and only then they can produce, and produce *in accordance with possible sales*; as long as people keep on complaining about bad business but vote for Hitler and other men with purely national vision, thus failing to reconcile economic demands with political views: just so long will a solution be far off! This is not the question of one nation being culpable for the whole calamity; it is the outgrowth of

an economic progress which has been and is being unduly exploited from one corner of the world to the other. No single nation can do anything by itself to remedy the present situation. If not all of the industrialized nations, at least a strong majority of them, will have to cooperate to bring order out of the present chaos. Such cooperation will be extremely difficult. Nations, as matters stand, can communicate with one another only through political "megaphones" in which sound economic considerations have little, if anything, to say. There is no international economic body which might serve as a platform for economic discussions between two nations, say, United States and Great Britain, or Germany and France, or Italy and the Balkans, and so forth.

Economics deals in one language, politics speaks another. The two conflicting tendencies will go on, leading to more confusion and greater animosity and antagonism until they arrive at the crossroads: when either the nations of Europe will recognize that only cooperation can lead them out of their misery and therefore settle down to the realization of such an aim. This is very unlikely in view of the extreme wave of nationalism reigning in practically all of the larger European nations, not to speak of the smaller units where it is worse than ever. Or another war, one of "purification," will destroy millions of lives and billions of dollars in values but perhaps leave in its wake a better conception of the relation between economic trends and political endeavor and lay the foundation for a rule of internationalism which will replace the national and therefore contradictory tendencies of present-day politics.

BALLADE OF THE UNBORN

I hear it on my empty stair,
The sound of sturdy little feet;
Of three with dark and tousled hair,
Of one with curls like ripened wheat.
It nears, it nears, then beats retreat,
And silences encompass me.
The dream is ended that was fair,
That never more than dream shall be.

I hear it from the corner where
My lawn and joyless garden meet:
The silver laughter ringing rare,
Of lads and lassies free and fleet.
It nears, it nears, then beats retreat,
And loneliness envelopes me.
The dream is ended that was fair,
That never more than dream shall be.

I hear it on the evening air,
The sound beyond all music sweet
Of little ones at bed-time prayer
In faith and innocence complete.
It nears, it nears, then beats retreat,
And hopelessness descends on me.
The dream is ended that was fair,
That never more than dream shall be.

Princess, did you my dreaming share,
Of children born to you and me?
The dream is ended that was fair,
That never more than dream shall be.

FRANCIS WHITEHILL.

Education

Life in a Test-Tube

GEORGE H. MAHOWALD, S.J.

"HAVE you read the article in yesterday's *Tribune* about Dr. Crile's attempts to produce life?" The question was asked by an upstanding young man who, besides occasionally delving into his philosophy textbook, regularly and faithfully reads the *World's Greatest Newspaper*. The article referred to appeared about two weeks before the meeting, in Cleveland, of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Under the arresting headline interrogation (I quote from memory) "Scientist Creates Life?" the writer, in a mass of indefinite words, made one feel that something very mysterious had happened in Dr. Crile's laboratory, so that the proposed question ought to be answered in the affirmative.

To the direct query of the budding philosopher, the professor gave the simple answer "Yes, I read it." Nettled that his professor did not sense the tremendous implications of the recorded experiments, the young man urged: "Well, if it should prove true that life really was developed in the test-tube, that would be the end of our religion, wouldn't it?" "No," came the laconic reply; and this time the perturbed inquirer was shocked almost into oblivion. "Well," gasped the inheritor of the Socratic method, "How about the soul?"

What a life for a weary professor! His classes had just come to a happy close, bringing him visions of an old but comfortable rocker and a soothing pipe, such as John Wiltbye advocates for all male teachers, when he was waylaid by the youthful inquirer. Now, he was finally caught in a snare that could not be blasted by a simple "yes" or "no." Thank God, these wholesome students do not drive perplexing difficulties into the subconscious, laying the foundation for a messy complex or mental conflict, but bring them up for an airing in the clear sunlight of honest discussion.

Why must so many writers of today delight in spreading a veil of mist and haze, in casting a pall of smoky cloudiness about facts that, as a result, become indistinguishable? The smoke screen in the article was so thick that the inquirer heartily agreed with his professor that there were no discernible facts to discuss, and that the "policy of watchful waiting" is as necessary in popular reports of science as in politics.

Many a difficulty arises from a phantom that appears in the haze, and vanishes with the mist. In this instance, the waiting was not long. The very next day, the *Tribune* carried a paragraph or two under the title (again I quote from memory) "Crile Denies Report." Dr. Crile was quoted as saying that the account was unauthorized, that he had not developed life, that it was impossible to say whither his experiments would lead, and that the results, so far obtained, would be presented to the Convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Now that this convention has passed into history, we

may, by a slight digression, cite the following reports of his exhibit, as good as any we have seen thus far: "Brain fats, proteins and ash from *apparently* dead body cells, placed in water containing normal body salts, formed minute structures which multiplied by dividing in two. Many still doubted life, spoke of a new scientific tool" (*Time*, January 12, 1931). "Structures having the *appearance* of tiny living cells come into existence. Further researches may reveal that the cells are the same as those in a *dead* cancer. Dr. Crile terms the cells 'auto-synthetic' because they tend to put themselves together as the ingredients are added" (*Chicago Evening American*, December 29, 1930). Here there is no reason to change Dr. Crile's previous statement: "No life." As for further results, more power to the experimenters; and for us bystanders, eager and watchful waiting!

My young Socratic friend was duly impressed with the moral of watchful waiting. But true to the spirit of the Grand Inquisitor, he continued: "To my question: 'if life really were developed in a test-tube, wouldn't that be the end of our religion,'—why do you say 'no'?"

It seems to me that the reason why many people are perturbed, almost feeling the ground slip from under their feet, by some modern suggestions and hypotheses, is because these latter appear to them as something entirely new and unheard of among our poor, benighted, philosophic forbears. My theory was confirmed by the bright smile that illumined the questioner's face when he was reminded that, at least before Harvey's time, the whole line of great thinkers, including Albertus Magnus and St. Thomas, had kept the Faith in spite of their erroneous theory of spontaneous generation; and spontaneous generation, as also the "seminal conditions" of St. Augustine, necessarily postulates, in what is called inorganic matter, some kind of latent, potential life-forces which under proper circumstances, or under the influence of natural causes, can issue into actual manifestation of animal or vegetative life. His eyes fairly sparkled when he heard that Tongiorgi (for he had a surreptitious affection for that precocious Jesuit who illumined the halls of the Roman College, back in the 'fifties), while holding that life, even vegetative life, does not, and never will, proceed except from living beings, has this to say:

Certainly, if man had eyes keen enough to discern individually the atoms of ponderable as well as imponderable matter, and fingers deft enough to lay hold upon these same atoms and to dispose them according to the original type constructed by God, then, I believe, man could produce plants" (*Instit. Phil.*, Tom. III, 11th edition, p. 26).

Palmieri, Tongiorgi's successor in the 'sixties, does not venture to deny all probability to the contention that chemical elements might possibly be combined to form a vegetative organism (*Instit. Phil.* vol. 2, 1875, p. 275). I think both Tongiorgi (especially) and Palmieri are wrong, and that "there is such an essential difference between organic and inorganic matter that it is impossible to develop even vegetative life from the latter." But that isn't the point. The young man saw the point, and exclaimed: "Why, these moderns are 'pikers' compared with those old-timers who kept the Faith."

My questioner was satisfied, feeling that the present

situation did not require a detailed answer to his last sally, "How about the human soul?"

From vegetation to sensation and thought is a tremendous cry. Babies will not be grown in bottles, in spite of the fact that biologists, as Professor William Fielding Ogburn of the University of Chicago humorously charged them at the Cleveland Convention, suggest that they might be (*Chicago Tribune*, January 2, 1931)! Even Brisbane, dear Arthur, once in a while jumbles something together that isn't so bad. Thus in his column of December 30, 1930, he says: "Science *may* create life artificially" (which I do not admit). "You cannot create affection synthetically. All the science in the world will never create the affection of a field mouse mother for its young."

Sociology

A Picture of Prohibition

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

WHEN with infinite pains and an elaboration just short of genius, Tom Sawyer and Huck Finn had succeeded in freeing an already free man of color, old Miss Watson's Jim, that worthy cried out in admiration: "Dey ain't *nobody* kin git up a plan dat's mo' mixed-up en splendid den dat one wuz!"

The French press is puzzled by the Wickersham report, and the British public is muddled. At home, there is dispute in the Senate, and elsewhere, about the lacunae in the report, and on what President Hoover thinks about the whole performance. To all of us, it is in some degree like Tom Sawyer's emancipation plan—splendid, possibly, but a bit mixed up.

Yet I think that a series of quotations from this official paper (House Document No. 732, 71st Congress) can paint a vivid picture of Prohibition after ten years of experimentation. Mr. Wickersham vouches for the facts, all of which have been published in these pages at one time or other since 1920. I proceed to quote, then, without comment, first from the Report, and next from the individual opinions.

THE REPORT.

The Amendment and the National Prohibition Act inaugurated one of the most extensive and sweeping efforts to change the social habits of an entire nation recorded in history. It would naturally have been assumed that the enforcement of such a novel and sweeping reform in a democracy would have been undertaken cautiously, with a carefully selected and specially trained force adequately organized and compensated, accompanied by efforts to arouse to its support public sympathy and aid. No opportunity for such a course was allowed. Considerable public sentiment was, however, antagonized by the legislative fixing of the permissible content of alcohol at a percentage considerably below the possibility of intoxication (pp. 10-11).

Votes in colleges show an attitude of hostility to or contempt for the law on the part of those who are not unlikely to be leaders in the next generation. It is safe to say that a significant change has taken place in the

social attitude toward drinking. This may be seen in the views and conduct of social leaders, business and professional men in the average community. It may be seen in the tolerance of conduct at social gatherings which would not have been possible a generation ago. It is reflected in a different way of regarding drunken youth, in a change in the class of excessive drinkers, and in the increased use of distilled liquor in places and connections where it was formerly banned. It is evident that, taking the country as a whole, people of wealth, business men and professional men, and their families, and, perhaps, the higher-paid working men and their families, are drinking in large numbers in quite frank disregard of the declared policy of the National Prohibition Act (p. 21).

Upon the whole, however, they [the death rates] indicate that after a brief period in the first years of the Amendment there has been a steady increase in drinking (p. 22).

In consequence of the high development of illicit distilling, a steady volume of whiskey, much of it of good quality, is put in circulation (p. 29).

In some parts of the country enormous sums of money are derived from the business of illicit beer (p. 31).

Necessity seems to compel the virtual abandonment of efforts for effective enforcement at this point [liquor production in the home!] but it must be recognized that this is done at the price of nullification to that extent (p. 33).

It is common knowledge, and a general cause of dissatisfaction with enforcement of the National Prohibition Act, that the big operators or head men in the traffic are rarely caught (p. 36).

. . . Whiskey of good quality is obtainable substantially everywhere at prices not extravagant for persons of means. It is true many cannot afford these prices and for them a large amount of cheap, poor grade, or even poisonous liquor is constantly produced and is in general circulation (p. 39).

Virginia has been a zealous prohibition state since 1914. . . . Yet the number of arrests for drunkenness in Richmond has been growing steadily and has increased by more than one-third in five years. Also the testimony shows that the amount of liquor in circulation has grown steadily. Prices tell the same story. . . . Kansas has had state prohibition for more than fifty years. . . . It is significant that the death rate in Kansas from alcoholism and causes attributable to alcohol, which had fallen to a very low level between 1917 and 1920, has risen to the level of 1917 (pp. 40-41).

It is true that the chief centers of non-enforcement or ineffective enforcement are the cities. But since 1920 the United States has been preponderantly urban. A failure of enforcement in the cities is failure in the major part of the land in population and influence (p. 43).

. . . There was much corruption in connection with the regulation of the liquor traffic before prohibition. But the present regime of corruption in connection with the liquor traffic is operating in a new larger field, and is more extensive (p. 44).

Some advocates of the law have constantly urged and are still urging disregard or abrogation of the guarantees of liberty and of sanctity of the home which had been deemed fundamental in our policy (p. 46).

It is therefore a serious impairment of the legal order to have a national law upon the books theoretically governing the whole land and announcing a policy for the whole land which public opinion in many important centers will not enforce and in many others will not suffer to be enforced effectively (p. 49).

In consequence, many of the best citizens in every community, on whom we rely habitually for the upholding of law and order, are at most lukewarm as to the National Prohibition Act. Many who are normally law-abiding are led to an attitude hostile to the statute by a feeling that repression and interference with private conduct are carried too far. . . . This feeling is reinforced when it is seen that the wealthy are generally able to obtain pure liquors, where those with less means may run the risk of poisoning. . . . Moreover, searches of homes, especially under state laws, have necessarily seemed to bear more upon people of moderate means than upon those of wealth or influence (pp. 54-55).

Lawyers everywhere deplore, as one of the most serious effects of prohibition, the change in the general attitude toward the federal courts. Formerly, these tribunals were of exceptional dignity . . . and commanded wholesome fear and respect. The professional criminal who sometimes had scanty respect for the state tribunals, was careful so to conduct himself as not to come within the jurisdiction of the federal courts. The effect of the huge volume of liquor prosecutions, which has come to these courts under prohibition, has injured their dignity, impaired their efficiency, and endangered the wholesome respect for them which once obtained. . . . Prosecutors, federal and state, have been affected no less than courts. They have been appointed and elected too often under pressure of organizations concerned only with prohibition, as if nothing else were to be considered in the conduct of criminal justice (pp. 56-57).

It has been urged that there has been great improvement in domestic relations. But such few statistics as to divorce for drunkenness as are available and reasonably trustworthy, seem to show a steady increase in divorce on that ground, after a sharp drop in the initial years of prohibition. . . . So also as to the effect upon public health which has been urged by some writers. The steady development of means of conserving the public health, and the continual advance of medical science, preclude any just comparison of the statistical data available (pp. 72-73).

INDIVIDUAL OPINIONS.

The Eighteenth Amendment . . . is the first instance in our history in which the effort has been made by Constitutional provision to extend the police control of the federal government to every individual and home in the United States (*Henry W. Anderson*).

No less than eight states, containing one-fourth of the entire population of the United States, either have no enforcement law, or have repealed or voted to repeal

such laws. The people of other states are obviously contemplating similar action (*Id.*).

"The Congress shall have power to regulate or to prohibit the manufacture, traffic in or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, and the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof, for beverage purposes." This modification would bring the Amendment into conformity with the traditional principles of our system of government (*Id.*).

In my opinion, the Eighteenth Amendment should be repealed (*Newton D. Baker*).

I am one of the members who favor an immediate attempt at change. As I still hope that federal regulation of the liquor traffic may prove more effective than that of the states, I favor revision of the amendment rather than its repeal (*Ada L. Comstock*).

I agree with the conclusion of the report that enforcement and observance of the law have never been and are not now adequate or satisfactory, and do not warrant its continuance, unless a change is probable within a reasonable time (*William I. Grubb*).

I . . . believe that prohibition under the Eighteenth Amendment is entitled to a further trial, before a revision or repeal of the Amendment is recommended (*Id.*).

The saloon was the center of political activity, but I think the corruption was not so widespread and flagrant as it now is. The amounts involved were not so large. Corruption had not become such an established art and racketeering was unknown. It has now developed to a high degree of efficiency (*William S. Kenyon*).

If prohibition cannot be enforced, I should favor a trial of the system proposed by Commissioner Anderson (*Id.*).

Summarizing, my conclusion is that the Eighteenth Amendment cannot be effectively enforced without the active general support of public opinion and the law-enforcement agencies of the states and cities of the nation; that such support does not now exist; and that I cannot find sufficient reason to believe that it can be obtained. I see no alternative but repeal of the Amendment (*Monte M. Lemann*).

I have come to the conclusion that effective national enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment in its present form is unattainable; therefore, steps should be taken immediately to revise the Amendment (*Frank J. Loesch*).

Mr. Anderson has presented in his statement a plan for control under the proposed revision of the amendment which is the result of careful and scientific thought and seems to meet the necessities of the situation more adequately than any other that has been so far suggested (*Kenneth Mackintosh*).

The plan developed by Mr. Anderson and presented in his statement seems to me to be the best, and if after further trial prohibition is not enforceable I should favor serious consideration of his system (*Paul J. McCormick*).

While making enforcement as effective as we may, so long as the amendment as it is, remains the supreme law of the land, we should be at work to enable the fundamental difficulties to be reached. This, it seems clear, can

only be done by a revision of the amendment. . . . Mr. Anderson has proposed a well thought-out plan, based on study of systems of liquor control and their operation. His plan deserves careful consideration as the best and most complete which has been brought to our attention. This or some like plan for adapting national control to local conditions may well be the next forward step (*Roscoe Pound*).

. . . I have been forced to conclude that a further trial should be made of the enforceability of the Eighteenth Amendment under the present organization, with the help of recommended improvements (Chairman *George W. Wickersham*).

The nearest point of agreement reached by the Commission was on the Anderson plan, and that the President peremptorily rejects. Some comment on this plan is offered on the editorial page.

With Scrip and Staff

CATHOLIC ACTION is one of the four regular departments in the new Vatican fortnightly magazine, entitled *L'Illustrazione Vaticana*, which could be translated the *Vatican Illustrated Magazine* or the *Vatican Illustrated Fortnightly*. The other three departments are Religious Thought, World Events, and Literary Life. These groupings are themselves characteristic as reflecting the Holy Father's summing up of the most vital aspects of Catholic journalism.

The new review is thoroughly modern: lavishly up-to-date in format, illustrations, etc. The idea for it, says the Editor, Count de la Torre—who is also Editor of the *Osservatore Romano*—occurred in May of last year and came to maturity between the Feast of the Immaculate Conception and Christmas. The first number appeared on Christmas Day. The plan of the paper he likens to an observatory, from which to observe, for instance, "the sun of political life; its economic satellites; the sidereal systems of science and its applications," etc.

We plan to photograph the firmament of Catholicism. We want to catch on our plate the constellations of the Church, the movements, the journeys, the seasons, the laws of Christ's whole great world. We want the facts themselves to tell their story of marvels. We want Catholicism to speak with the clearness and efficacy which conquers and moves everybody, the genius and the plain man alike.

Glancing through the new review we see at once the wonderful progress made in the last two years in the modernization of the Vatican: the building of the Vatican railway station, the Governor's residence, the graceful new Ethiopian college, the home of the *Osservatore*, the complete modernization of the Vatican library with brand-new American filing systems concealed behind ancient carved doors. These and a hundred other items bear witness to the will of the Holy Father to leave nothing unspared whereby the Vatican can avail itself of all that is really good and valuable in the modern world. Illustrated topics on treasures of archeology and art and last-minute photographs of the missions add to its pictorial richness. The price is 150 lire per annum; the address: "*L'Illustrazione Vaticana*," Vatican City.

THE first instalment of the department entitled Catholic Action in the new Vatican review is devoted in large measure to the work of our American N. C. W. C. and to the British Catholic Truth Society and Catholic Evidence Guild. All of these are active in the distribution of Catholic literature, as well as its production. For production and distribution are twin sisters which can never be separated one from the other. Our veteran in the distribution of Catholic literature, Mr. David J. Daze, who began this work in 1912, has with the help of his assistant, Dan Huntington, distributed ten tons of Catholic literature in the year 1930. His work was done under the auspices of the Knights of Columbus Catholic Literature Distribution Bureau in Los Angeles.

The Catholic Truth Society of Manila which distributes over the Philippine Islands more than 300,000 pieces of Catholic literature a year is doing much to distribute Catholic magazines in the public and private libraries and reading rooms of the high schools in the Philippines. The Rev. Louis L. R. Morrow, Director of the Society, is anxious to obtain the cooperation of Catholic editors in his work. His address is: The Catholic Truth Society, 1199 M. H. Del Pilar, Manila, P. I.

The Right Rev. Mar Ivanios, in India, who until September 29 last was a schismatic (Jacobite) Bishop and Metropolitan, is anxious for books for the instruction of converts. He is frequently called upon to supply books to well-meaning and intending converts. For his entering the Catholic Church has begun a mass-movement of his former Jacobite brethren, so much so, writes Father L. D. Murphy, S.J., from Loyola College, Madras, that it "it is not extravagant to hope for perhaps 100,000 converts within a year. If they are serious books, so much the better; and if on the Faith, best of all. Address: The Right Rev. Mar Ivanios, Archbishop of Bethany, Tiruvella, Travancore, India.

The Catholic Union of Ceylon has for the past ten years also been active in disseminating Catholic literature, both in English and in the Sinhalese language. The Hon. Joseph J. Gnanamuttu, secretary of the Union's Literature Committee (Peradeniya, Ceylon), reports that 916,150 individual copies of the Committee's publications have been issued since its inception in 1919. During the past year 123,500 copies of various publications were distributed; and, in eleven years, 1,537,250. Free libraries, press Sundays, reading circles, a monthly magazine, the Messenger of the Sacred Heart, in both languages, and frequent lectures are part of the Catholic Union's activities. The Literature Committee is under the direction of the Very Rev. M. J. LeGoc, O.M.I., M.A.; and receives the cordial cooperation of the Oblate Fathers.

ON the other side of the globe, the O.M.I. Fathers are following the Vatican example by also starting a new magazine, a quarterly review, in French, under the auspices of the University of Ottawa (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*), published for \$2.00 a year; the Rev. R. Leblanc, Secretary, Avenue des Oblats, Ottawa, Ont., Canada. Says the foreword:

Though the new review embraces all the regions which the

restless minds of the children of Adam endeavors to explore: Sacred Scripture, Theology, Canon and Civil Law, History, Philosophy, Science and Art, . . . it will, nevertheless, speak as little as possible to abstract human beings and unreal worlds. It will recall to our own times and our own contemporaries the unchanging doctrines that guide the ever-changing opinions of mankind. Particularly it will look for practical solutions for problems of the moment and the remedies for the evils of our times. Political unity, the peace of the Church, the prosperity of the working classes, the education of youth are the things which lay principal claim to the time and to the enthusiasm of our collaborators.

The Archbishop of Liverpool, Dr. Downey, is Editor-in-Chief of another newcomer, the *Clergy Review*, published (£1 per annum) at the office of the *Universe*, 1 Arundel Street, London, W. C. 2. In its first issue, for January, 1931, Archbishop Downey's study of the idea of God among primitive peoples testifies to the scholarly yet timely standard which the Review expects to follow. Special attention is paid to homiletic and moral features; and there is a distinguished list of contributors.

PRODUCTION and Distribution, however, have a third little sister in the family. This poor Cinderella is called Revision. Hers is the drudgery; but the Prince Charming of Truth Triumphant is sure to pay her court. The publishing house of Herder in Freiburg, we learn from the N. C. W. C. News Service, one of the world's largest Catholic publishing offices, will expend approximately \$3,000,000 in the publication of a completely revised edition of its large Catholic encyclopedia, Herder's *Lexikon*. The first volumes are expected to appear in 1931. In the revised edition there will be a total of 170,000 key words, which will be 70,000 more than in the last edition. And it will be full of maps.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, in this country, announces also its intended revision, in accordance with the resolution on November 12 of the American Hierarchy, which will make of the Encyclopedia practically a new work. Every article will be recast or rewritten. There will be about 3,000 new articles; new plates, style of type, illustrations, maps, and format. It is estimated that the revision can be completed within three years, and will be done under the supervision of the present editors: the Rt. Rev. Dr. Pace; Right Rev. Bishop Shahan; Dr. James J. Walsh; and Father Wynne, S.J. The full purpose of the reorganization of the editorial staff is not merely to produce a new edition of a great reference work, valuable as this will be, but to create a permanent organization for the promotion and publication of Catholic literature.

At Seton Hill College, Greensburg, Pa., the students' Catholic Evidence Guild has undertaken, in its own quiet way, to revise the Cambridge Modern History from the standpoint of Catholic truth. The first eight volumes are brought to book in the history classes, and their results published in the *Setonian*, the college monthly. The young critics, under the guidance of Prof. Summerfield Baldwin, show a discriminating spirit, ready to give all the credit possible to the Cambridge authors, yet gently taking them to task on such matters as Pope Alexander VI's alleged simony; the life of Luther; Mary Stuart; Spain under Philip II, etc.

THE PILGRIM.

Literature

Some Novelists in Tradition

FRANCIS X. CONNOLLY

LITERATURE must commemorate with history the catastrophe of the War. The conflict that shattered political and economic structures likewise toppled ancient palaces of the arts. The whole tradition of culture, associated with ideals which had disappeared in cloudy philosophies, was jettisoned to make room for a new sentimentalism. Civilization lost its poise in the fierce scramble of the thinkers to salvage bits of experience, dim ecstasies, forgotten fragments of an ancient peace that lurked in the memory with intimations of happiness, in groping for realities broken by lost faiths and fallen standards.

It is small wonder that the novel should have been stamped with the character of the age. The most plastic and sensitive of all literary forms, alert to the popular taste, as quick as the newspaper to adopt the contemporary attitude, the novel could not burrow into the scholar's chamber or moulder gracefully in the library. Unlike the essay, or even poetry, the novel is essentially democratic. It is the forum of current opinions, a reflector of fashionable vanities and affections; and when humanity lost its moorings the novel drifted away with it; when the liberated children of the War decade endeavored to recommence history, the novel dutifully undertook to imitate the experiment. The sane objectivity of the Victorians, the careful discrimination exercised by literary generations from Cervantes to Hardy was discarded for "the stream of consciousness," for a disproportionate and hence unreal realism.

For a number of years we saw the new dynasty represented singly and severally by Dreiser, Lawrence, Anderson, Proust, Joyce and Rosamund Lehman, and in the present by Hemingway and his chief disciple, Morley Callaghan. Vision, the quality inseparable from great art, was perverted to introspection, and it was only because time gradually restored man's rational balance and because the autocracy of the dynasts was repulsive to the least refined tastes that authors loyal to tradition were allowed a rehearing.

A handful of critics who had faith in real values formed the advance guard for the return of art opposed to the modern spirit. Timidly at first, but with the accumulating force of intrinsic strength, the reaction against literary anarchy progressed. Willa Cather, Henry Handel Richardson and Sigrid Undset most particularly have vivified a philosophic protest in enduring creative form.

Space permits only a most cursory glance at the most significant work of these authors. It is worthy of note that in the swing back to tradition the leaders are women. Man made a psychological mess with his blunt intuitions; trained through the generations to the steady progress of reason, he abandoned regularity for unsteady leaps, masculine precision (and slowness withal) for the swift inaccuracy of the typical feminine mind. Paradoxically enough, it remained for women to attack the womanly

attitude, for the authors of "My Antonia," "Ultima Thule" and "The Snake Pit" to invigorate a subjectivized fiction with fresh draughts of blustering reality.

Willa Cather fought the man's battle against a regiment of men. Teacher of the prairie regions, exponent of a people and a civilization already misinterpreted by Anderson and Dreiser, she chanted epics of raw courage and high faiths. The slow-burning despair eating into stout hearts, the hard life of the children of the soil, straight and confining as the lane of the plow, the bitter struggle wrenching tribute from a reluctant earth meant more to her than the whimperings of morbid boys who had fallen on Zola before they could understand a catechism. When advanced New York reviews were introducing Joyce and Proust to yawning readers, Willa Cather caught the high optimism of the new world in "The Song of the Lark"; when the Voltaire of Baltimore was foisting on gullible university students the pessimism of his apotheosized Nietzsche, she was unfolding a magnificent vision of truth, a transcript of living beauty in "Death Comes for the Archbishop." It is to the credit of the late Stuart Sherman that for all his compromises with an original critical genius he continually preached the excellence of Miss Cather.

She is not a literary fashion. Her work is not sprung from the Conrad Aiken movement. She has rather the permanence of permanent things, of clear vision, of life set down in perfect sympathy. The thought of life did not overpower her, or drive her to Paris, or the warm sands of the Riviera; sentiment she had, but no hysteria, no neurotic obsession for mere weakness. She left that for our Bodenheims.

But as valuable as was the contribution of Miss Cather to the novel of tradition, the influence of Henry Handel Richardson, the pseudonym of an Australian author, is of deeper importance. Although she commenced writing a score of years ago it was not until 1929 that "Ultima Thule" appeared in America. "Australia Felix" and "The Way Home," first and second members of the trilogy, were issued rapidly to satisfy eager readers. "Ultima Thule" is a perfect tragedy, as schematically rigid and consistent as Oedipus or Agamemnon, as clearly in the heritage of the classic as "Vanity Fair" itself. Just as Miss Cather sees the life of the West clearly and artistically, so does the creator of Richard Mahony reproduce Australia of the last century.

For the classic element in Richardson, as in Cather, consists not only in form, but rather in that priceless attitude of wisdom, that exquisite balance of judgment that makes the genial formlessness of Dickens a magnificent joy. The tragedy of Richard Mahony is perhaps the most agonizing since the dark portrait of Hamlet, to whom he bears no little resemblance. Etched almost in the shadowy colors of the preternatural, streaked with a grayness suggestive of the bleak life of the spiritual exile, Richard Mahony, from the pride of wealth and the tower of self-esteem, is toppled into a whirlpool that finally engulfs him. Mary, his wife, and perhaps the greatest character in all modern literature, lives to bring life to a standstill by eking out rent money in a provincial gov-

ernment office. But Richardson's vision was not destroyed by the murkiness of the scene; the whirring of the wings of darkness did not alarm her decisions out of reason. In the midst of life her characters cling to real things, to the hard duties of the parent, to the, pounding, terrible fact of responsibility, of dependence.

The tremendous crisis of "Ultima Thule," when the crazed Richard finally casts aside the phial of poison and renews the struggle he knows must end in defeat, combines the finest dramatic art with exceptional philosophic penetration. The book might very well have sunk to the silly cynicism of Anatole France, or to the self-pity of a Maupassant. But unlike the men who fancy themselves realists, Richardson possessed enough reality to send the fates spinning their last skein. There is a *katharsis* in the trilogy, a beautiful streak of light in the mass of dark blues and purples, an open window in a prison cell. For a tragedy without a purgation is unreasonable; art never broods without a higher purpose.

Richard Mahony fell through pride; he was not excused, but he was pitied; immutable laws were not dissolved to pardon a weakness. In the order of things he had to work out the patterns of his life with his own hands. And the admirable point of the character rests in this, that in painting him Richardson has achieved at the same time sublimation and idealization. A human being fighting manfully to emancipate himself from his own weakness is in himself a noble, a sublimated, an idealized character. It requires a great artist to discover the obvious commonplace that man, acting as man, acts according to an ideal.

Henry Handel Richardson deserves of course more adequate treatment. It is sufficient here that we indicate merely her contribution towards a restoration of reason in fiction. Analysis has not preoccupied her with the curious and grotesque; insight has not made her myopic. She excels in perspective, in vision, in the manipulation of intricate movements, in elaborate unity, in architectonic structure.

Where Willa Cather and Henry Handel Richardson restored intelligent sympathy and the seeing eye of the classic, Sigrid Undset has completed the gigantic task of making man realize that there are other facts than the states of consciousness, that man faces, not only himself, but the world, as well. This element is not absent in the authors mentioned above; neither is sympathy and vision apart from the work of Sigrid Undset. But the Norwegian novelist appreciates more profoundly the essential nature of humanity. She feels with and sees through her Olav Andusson; more than that she can reproduce his Inferno, his descent into the miseries of his own being. And while she lacks the grace of Cather and the Grecian unity of the Australian, Mme. Undset excels both in purely human understanding.

Some critics claim that the matter of her novels could gain with careful pruning. An incontestable master of the dramatic, unerring describer of the warring personality, she has transfixed truth with a sharp pen. Undoubtedly her particularly free inquiry into the absorbing matters of man tends to alienate some minds. I do

not raise the point here. I merely indicate that, with her literary sisters, she has succeeded in reestablishing a coign of vantage for the novelist, a lofty place, high above the obscuring clouds of temperament and personality.

In her massive trilogies, "Kristin Lavransdatter" and "The Master of Hestviken" she has written the epic of the human conscience. Tense with life, she has managed to direct the powerful stream of robust thought towards its proper outlet. The finality of the action determines the magnificent strength and moving splendor of the episodes of medieval Norway. Continental realists, who in accepting her work have illogically placed her among alien spirits, failed to sense her tremendous spiritual energy. There is an almost physical weight of guilt that differentiates Mme. Undset from the usual photographers of nature; and unlike the Rollands she has never committed the intellectual sin of shutting her eyes to inescapable conclusions.

It is extremely amusing to speculate upon the quandary of the philosopher of literature in the future. When the world minds of Wells and Shaw, Spengler and Keyserling assume their proper unimportance, he shall gape at the homely picture of three women dusting away cobwebs and airing the musty chambers of a decadent era.

REVIEWS

Church History. By REV. JOHN LAUX, M.A. New York: Benziger Brothers. \$2.25.

This little book is a magnificent achievement. It is not just that Father Laux has put the whole story of the Church within the limits of 600 pages; but that he has done it in a way to captivate the attention of a high-school student, and to win the admiration of the trained historian. The narrative is admirable. The diction is easy, and not without grace; and the illustrations, the quotations, the type, the headings of chapter and paragraph, the hints for study, the synthetic summaries, all help to sustain the interest of the most casual reader. But there is something more valuable than these pedagogical excellences. There is the evidence of careful planning, critical scholarship, mature judgment, and above all, of a balanced personality which is so essential to the presentation of the story of the Catholic Church. Issues are faced which involve principles that have, at all times, been passionately discussed, and, too often, extravagantly applied. Personalities are presented, and events described, which have become familiar in the form of traditional casts, but which needed to be subjected to the fire of criticism and remolded in a fuller synthesis. Father Laux picks his way through the tangles of events and criticism, and holds his course along the rocky ledges of issues and principles with something of the serenity of Dante in his dream. Thus in the treatment of the "Rapid Diffusion of Christianity," nothing which the solid erudition of Harnack has brought to light is neglected; but it is admitted, as it properly should be, only to the category of "important influence." The vaporous rationalism of Gibbon is found to disappear in the strong light of the fact that "the primary cause was the divine assistance which had been promised by Christ." Or take the eternal antithesis of "Scholasticism and Mysticism." The issues, fiercely debated in the Middle Ages, were never more alive than in the thought of today. Father Laux supplements the bald statement of facts by the following comment, which may be taken as typical of his unfailing moderation: "If theology is treated merely as an affair of the intellect and the reason, it is devoid of all living and life-giving warmth; if it lacks clear and precise notions, if there is no method in its treatment, no logical classifications, definition, division, it will end in sentimentalism and heresy." If there is a fault to be found (apart from a few misprints, and some tiny errors—Savonarola was not beheaded but burned,) it is the lack of gener-

osity to the immense activity of the Church in the last three centuries. If the last hundred pages were multiplied by two, the balance of the book would be all but perfect.

G. G. W.

Why Rome. By SELDEN PEABODY DELANY. New York: The Dial Press. \$2.50.

Why I Am and Why I Am Not a Catholic. By HILAIRE BELLOC and Others. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.00.

Both these volumes are obviously intended for non-Catholic readers and more especially adherents of the Protestant Episcopalian or Anglican churches. The second is a symposium professing to present the reasons for the faith that some ten prominent English writers profess. In its perusal probably the best results will follow for the reader by taking the second part as a preliminary study to the considerations so convincingly and cogently presented by such representative writers as Father Knox, Sheila Kaye-Smith, Father Martindale, Belloc, and Archbishop Goodier, the first three brought to Rome by different paths, but all telling why the positions assumed by Dr. Orchard, Professor Goudge, the Lord Bishop of Gloucester, and the other contributors to the second section of the volume are not sound. Dr. Delany's book will have a more direct appeal to Protestants in the United States and is mainly autobiographic. The distinguished convert is intent on presenting the deficiencies which he found in his many years as an Anglican minister, where he professed a Catholicism divorced from the Vicar of Christ, and contrasts that situation with what complete adherence to the one holy Roman Catholic Church has to promise. He finds Anglicanism, and especially Anglo-Catholicism deficient in its moral and dogmatic code and in what it has to offer for the sacramental and devotional life of the people. In a way that must convince the unprejudiced reader he demonstrates that Anglicanism is not Christ's religion, that it has not a true priesthood, and that, finally, it is dogmatically and historically unsound for its rejection of a Primacy of jurisdiction in Christ's Church, as this is unmistakably demonstrated in Holy Writ and reinforced by Tradition.

W. I. L.

Life in Elizabethan Days. By WILLIAM STEARNS DAVIS. New York: Harper and Brothers. \$3.50.

The tendency towards fictionization continues apace. Its influence upon history in general and biography has been sufficiently indited, but the most recent attempts to put the philosophical and social backgrounds of an age in narrative form are only beginning to attract favor. Lewis Mumford made use of the device in his "Golden Day" and Stuart Sherman did not hesitate to employ a racy prose in his most serious critical essays. The present editor of the *Saturday Review of Literature* is another literary philosopher whose attention to the particular has inclined him towards the narrative method of explanation. Mr. Davis, although it is hardly fair to say that he is a conscious follower of the modern style, is nevertheless its most outstanding exemplar. As a sequel to his "Life in a Medieval Barony," he now offers a story of Elizabethan England as it is revealed in its human documents. Written "in terms of the concrete," its concern is almost entirely with manners and customs, with a typical English town, a typical English manor, and the typical activities of the typical Englishman. Frankly sympathetic with the national character, Mr. Davis surveys the eating, sleeping, drinking, schooling, and diversions of the Hollydean family and their retainers, and with a commendable nicety works in the contemporary ideals and the social codes under which they labor. To him "Gloriana's England" is a Tory's paradise, despite, or with, Tory morals. There is the usual jingoistic turn to the business whenever there is reference to the victory over the Spanish Armada or the quality of English seamanship, but the general tone is quite inoffensive. In his chapter on the inns Mr. Davis pictures accurately and vividly, with a good deal of enjoyable romance, the informal chatter of the public house. There is another chapter on Elizabethan players, which, despite its obvious indebtedness to Sidney Lee, is nevertheless a sparkling account of Shakespeare in the provinces. However one

might quarrel with or deplore some of his omissions, it is quite impossible to deny that his "Life in the Elizabethan Days" is an accurate and completely readable picture of a fascinating period of British history. It is, however, painfully obvious that the volume lacks the critical attitude necessary to make it important.

F. X. C.

The Godlike Daniel. By SAMUEL HOPKINS ADAMS. New York: Sears Publishing Company. \$5.00.

This is a biography of Daniel Webster. It is a life-story charmingly told. Reading it arouses serious reflection. Can the rewards and emoluments of a brilliant and successful political career ever be equated with the chagrin, disappointments and sorrows necessarily incurred in their pursuit? Only exhaustive experience can answer. From his college days at Dartmouth, to his death-bed in Marshfield, Mass., the intelligence of this clear-minded statesman was troubled and clouded by his utter ineptitude to square his income with his obligations. Daniel Webster was always in debt. The science of ordinary monetary affairs was a puzzle never understood by him. It is the opinion of his biographer that: "To attempt definite analysis of the Websterian system of finance is to court chronic vertigo." In government, however, Webster rose to sustained heights of statesmanship, the peak of which was reached in his letters to Ashburton, which a fellow statesman pronounced: "the poetry of diplomacy . . . unequaled in dignity and strength of composition." Firm in belief, though often lax in external conformity, Webster held that "anything in Holy Writ was beyond dispute." He found "no difficulty in reconciling science and dogma." "Extraneous facts must adjust themselves as best they might." When finally aware of the sheer hopelessness of ever becoming President, the goal of his life-long labors and ambition, he said: "I am too near God to have a single heart-burning against a human creature, but I have chagrin profound as my entire nature." Shortly before death he wrote to President Fillmore: "Your letters are always kind. I am in the hands of God, and may He preserve and bless you and yours forever more." Such was Daniel Webster, strong, just, forgiving. Appropriately therefore does his biographer style him "The Godlike Daniel."

M. J. S.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Preaching Christ.—In an age that associates godlessness with so much of American university education, it is refreshing to note that the William Belden Noble lectures delivered in Harvard University in 1928 by G. A. Johnston Ross were a plea for the students to interest themselves in Christ's service, especially in the ministry. Under the title "Why Preach Christ?" (Harvard University Press. \$1.50), these papers of Dr. Ross' have been published. However, while the author's fine purpose cannot be gainsaid and deserves commendation, one does feel that the inducements he offers to urge the students to make Christ known and trusted by their fellowmen fall far short of being satisfactorily convincing. Most of them are purely humanitarian and emphasis on the supernatural is avoided, though it is the Divinity of Christ and His value to the human soul both for time and eternity rather than for the sociological advantages which His doctrine contains, that He is worth following. There is a decided Modernistic ring in the lectures.

Rollin H. Walker offers in "Jesus and Our Pressing Problems" (Abingdon Press. \$1.50), some thoughts that will put Christian doctrine and practice in harmony, as he believes, with contemporary life. He discusses such topics as the Lord's theories about property, the family, man's relations with his fellows, suffering, etc. While there is much that is provocative in the volume and the author's presentation of his subject is generally interesting, from a theological viewpoint many Christians could not agree with much that he says. Too often what he states lacks authority, and there is a good deal of personal speculation, for which Professor Walker does not give a warrant, regarding the person and teaching of Christ, and the interpretation of His preaching.

On the assumption that Christ has gotten out of the world

and that it is necessary for Him to be brought back to it, a thesis about which something may be said, George Tolover Tolson writes "The Renaissance of Jesus" (Abingdon Press. \$2.00). However, his interpretation of Jesus is quite liberal and highly personal and in conformity neither with Scripture nor Tradition. The author has read widely apparently in church history, but with an obvious prejudice, while he has allowed himself to accept very many of the teachings of rationalist and the Modernist critics who have lost their vogue and authority among contemporary Scriptural scholars and theologians.

Taking the Sermon on the Mount as the subject of his study Doremus A. Hayes writes "The Heights of Christian Living" (Abingdon Press. \$2.00). The author takes the Gospel text and comments on its outstanding passages with the intention that his readers may come to make the truths inculcated in the Lord's discourse practical in his life. On the other hand, there are throughout implications and suggestions of a liberalism that cannot be reconciled with orthodox Christianity; neither is the author always felicitous nor consistent. The volume is a sequel to "The Heights of Christian Blessedness," where Dr. Hayes began his study of the Sermon on the Mount.

Echoes of Cloister Life.—Adding to the "Many Mansions" series, whose objective is to bring together in easily accessible form essays on the spirit and ideal of the chief religious Orders of the Church, Father James, O.S.F.C., has prepared "The Franciscans" (Macmillan. 90c.) to which Father Thomas Plassmann, O.F.M., has written the Introduction. Naturally sketchy, very much that is interesting in the life of St. Francis himself and in the development of the Franciscan Order is omitted, but withal the reader is introduced to the things that count in the Franciscan spirit. After outlining the romantic and fascinating career of the "Poor Man of Assisi," and discussing his Rule, the author studies the Franciscans in their contributions to the Church and in their special type of spirituality. The little volume should interest all those for whom St. Francis has an appeal and should do much to counteract that unfortunate naturalism that some recent devotees have drawn about the Saint, for it is outstanding in Father James' story that St. Francis was what he was because of Divine grace and that he is to be rightly appraised only in the light of his supernatural virtue, not of any superficial sentimental or natural qualities.

Some years ago Elinor Tong Dehey published a sketch of the origin and activities of the outstanding religious Congregations of women in the United States. The recent development and expansion of all of our Sisterhoods has made a revised edition of "Religious Orders of Women in the United States" as timely as it is informative and useful. The volume which is profusely illustrated is interesting for its accounts of pioneer hardships endured by the generous women who laid the foundations of convent life in our country and its faithful presentation of the manifold current movements going on among our nuns to keep abreast of the development of the Church in the present century. The sketches are arranged in chronological order, beginning with the Ursulines, and the practical usefulness of the book is helped by a supplement listing the different communities, the Catholic colleges for women, and the Catholic hospitals, according to States. There is also a useful glossary of technical names connected with the Sisterhoods appended. Besides its informational value the work touches the history of practically every diocese in the country and includes the chief biographic data, much of it inspiring, in the lives of those women whose consecration has brought glory to the Church and untold benefits to the nation. It ought unquestionably to be part of every Catholic reference or historical library, while if made available to high school and college student sit may be a means of directing some young women's minds to the higher things of life.

Prepared for the Sisters in our convents but readily adaptable to others intent on the higher spiritual life, are the retreat lectures that make up the two volumes of "Waiting for the Paraclete" (Cincinnati: St. Francis Book Shop), by the Rev. Fulgence Meyer, O.F.M. They are written with that same clarity of style and happy blending of practical reflections with

interesting instruction of frequent examples by way of illustration emphasizes the points the author would insist upon, while the straightforward presentation of Divine truth in a convincing way gives promise that meditation upon or studious reading of the volume will be bound to produce fruit in the soul. In an appendix at the end of the second volume the author offers some very practical suggestions for those nuns upon whom devolves the duty of arranging for community retreats or taking care of the retreat program or the retreat master's needs.

Romance and history have been combined by William B. Gross in "The Conquest of California" (Stratford. \$2.50). Mingling with an account of the religious activities of the early Franciscan friars on our western coast line, the author spins an interesting story around the heroic but little known Juan Estevan Rocha. The basic fact is historical and quite generally the author keeps close to the authentic mission histories, though sufficient play is left to the imagination to make the narrative fascinating. The author is sympathetic with his subject and the missionaries, though here and there are evidences that he does not fully appreciate their motives or Catholic practices. The volume reaches its climax in the graphic account of a battle at Mission San Diego where Rocha's heroism was tested to the limit and where the outcome was most significant for the history of the United States.

The Enigma of Life.—The problem of life after death has always been an intriguing one, though on this score the Catholic Christian can have no doubts. Some reasons for the faith that is in him, though grounded for the most part in rational philosophy and not in formal revelation, are contained in "Immortality" (Herder. \$2.25), translated from the French of the Rev. Theodore Mainage, O.P., by the Rev. J. M. Lelen. The author marshals in an interesting and up-to-date way the arguments that lead from a study of the universe, the testimony of conscience, the nature of man, etc., to a conviction of the soul's immortality and a future life. In doing this he touches upon a number of cognate topics that add to the interest of the volume as, for example, spiritism, evolution, etc. For those who reject the Bible and pride themselves on being governed by their reason and yet assume the agnostic position that nothing may be known of the future, Theodore Mainage's volume will prove a powerful antidote.

Jacob Helder was obviously interested in finding out what the world thinks about immortality and why men look forward to a future life. In the "Greatest Thoughts on Immortality" (Richard R. Smith. \$2.00) he has compiled the opinions of a large number of prominent men of all religions, and of no religion, on the subject. While some of the quotations are negative and many more distinctly vague, and still others unorthodox from a Christian angle, as a collection of opinions on immortality and as a reference book about the subject, preachers and others may find it a useful volume to have at hand. As for the problem of immortality itself, what the Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P., is cited as saying is probably most to the point: "My irrefragable faith in immortality is based upon belief in a Divine revelation; a communication of the truth from God to man through Christ. All other reasons, intuitions, musings are subsidiary and perhaps under close logical scrutiny of little or no value."

"The March of Life" (Houghton Mifflin. \$1.75) is an effort by Elizabeth H. Dewart to reconcile man's evolution, which the author accepts as a scientific fact though its proofs are lacking, with God and religion. The volume shows considerable acquaintance with many natural phenomena of which the author writes in an interesting and fascinating way, but withal it offends seriously against the laws of logic and entirely ignores the philosophical principle of causality. God in this volume is not so much the Creator of man and the universe as their creature. There is confusion, too, in the author's ideas about spirit and matter, and the human soul and its faculties. While not rejecting the Bible story of creation, it is accepted as based on a myth, and, though Christ is spoken of reverentially, His natural Divine Sonship is not admitted, nor is the historical truth that he established an organized religion.

Communications

Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

For an Institute of Catholic History

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The interesting communication in the issue of AMERICA for January 10, from Frances Louise Trew, of Washington, suggesting an Institute of Catholic History, again brings up for consideration a project first outlined, I believe, by the Rev. Dr. Peter Guilday at the meeting of the United States Catholic Historical Society here in New York, on the evening of February 6, 1918. The late Cardinal Farley presided and he gave the idea a generous approbation. Dr. Guilday further elaborated the details of such an undertaking in a brochure, "On the Creation of an Institute for American Church History," which he published in 1924. It was intended to be a memorial to John Gilmary Shea and commemorating the tercentenary (1934) of the Church in the United States. This Institute was to consist of three separate, though not necessarily distinct, parts: (1) source collections in a depository of national Catholic archives; (2) a national Catholic library of printed materials; (3) the Institute itself for training students. Dr. Guilday very aptly noted that the collection of documents and material in any depository "will never furnish us with the correct history of the Church unless these sources are interpreted by scholars specially trained for the work."

We have now engaged in the preservation of our historical records, the United States Catholic Historical Society of New York and the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, both founded after the appeal of the Plenary Council of 1884. The New York society has published twenty-four volumes of its "Records and Studies," which contain many valuable papers. In its Monograph Series there are thirteen separate volumes of more complete, comprehensively treated subjects. The Philadelphia Society has a fine library and publishes its *Records* as a quarterly review. Stimulated by these examples, Catholic historical societies were organized in St. Paul (1904); St. Louis (1917); Chicago (1918) (*Mid-America*, the quarterly of the latter, has been doing splendid work); and the American Catholic Historical Association of Washington, D. C. (1919), the scope of which was extended to include general Church history in the papers published in its *Review*.

However, while stimulating interest in American Catholic historical studies, and affording means for publication of the fruits of research, none of these organizations, to the best of my knowledge, has been able to finance research by offering fellowships, etc. This, as I understand it, is the forward step urged by Miss Trew.

Although Dr. Guilday was careful to explain that in the Institute he contemplated he did not expect that these organizations should sink their individual identity and lose their local standing in a national amalgamation, there does not seem to be any good reason why they should not foster his general plan and be factors in whatever operating body should be evolved to carry on the work he has outlined as so necessary for a practical solution of the ever-increasing problem of the preservation of our American Catholic historical records. How this can be done is apparently the present pressing matter for consideration.

New York.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The suggestion for an Institute of History in the nature of a research foundation, made by Miss Trew in her letter in the issue of AMERICA for January 10, is indeed stimulating.

While the stability necessary for a research foundation may come from an endowment or from an organization well founded, the idea is so new to American Catholics that perhaps a wider response might be secured by narrowing the aim to a particular field; for example, Spanish civilization in Spain and the Americas, or Russia and the Far East, both key points of twentieth-century history-to-be.

As much as money is necessary, there is also need of those who can direct the research to coordinated ends. Such a project, primarily cultural and historical, might thus be considered in relation to other Catholic activities in the same or related fields. We already have several Catholic historical associations in the United States. Possibly if these would get together and agree on particular fields of research for each one, duplication of appeal would be avoided, as also duplication of effort, and experiences would be pooled.

Research work properly belongs in connection with universities, which is another point to be considered. Hence the chief regional Catholic universities of the United States might, through a general meeting of representatives, agree on a field of research for each one. Perhaps the graduate schools, today facing serious problems, might find a way out of some of them through this idea. Thus, for example, Fordham University is specializing in political science, Georgetown in international law, and the Catholic University in education. No one of our universities has yet the endowment to make a bid for supremacy in all the fields of economics, political science, law and history (fields in which it is most imperative that the Catholic tradition and idea be emphasized), but the universities could achieve much by specializing.

Then such an Institute as Miss Trew suggests could be financed and its members be sure that their funds would be directed to the immediate needs of constructive research. Not all research is that.

What the intellectual leadership of Catholics needs today is, first, a positive plan directed to explaining and fostering Catholic culture, and, secondly, leaders adequately equipped to carry out the findings of research. We have numerous Catholic organizations aiming to do the first, but it is the experience of many that when they join and attend meetings, all seems so haphazard, so irrelevant to the professed aim, with every one in such a hurry to get somewhere else, that too little positive good is accomplished. This is not universally true, of course, but it is so too often.

It does not seem that an institute apart from the support of either the historical associations or the universities could remedy this defect. But if there are those who think that it can, and will start it, then I, with at least three others, would be glad to send in ten dollars apiece.

New York.

M. R. MADDEN.

On Reading Encyclicals

To the Editor of AMERICA:

While reading the fine editorial on the Pope's Encyclical in the issue of AMERICA for January 17, a query entered my mind. Why it is that the Pontiff's letters are not given the prominence in parishes that the Bishop's letters receive? Of course, the Bishop's letters come to us with directions that they are to be read at all the Holy Masses on a definite Sunday. Fine as these letters are, it seems proper that the words of our Pontiff should receive at least equal consideration. It may be said that they are too lengthy to be read on one Sunday. True, but why could they not be read on consecutive Sundays? Every priest knows that his parishioners would learn more in listening to the instructive words of the Pope than to his own stammerings.

Will half of the Catholic people read the masterful Encyclical "On Christian Marriage"? They will not, if it is not read to them. But we could, I believe, hope for much fruit if priests would read to the people, serially, the wonderful letter on "The Christian Education of Youth," and the recent "Casi Connubii."

Crown Point, Ind.

(REV.) JOSEPH HAMMES.

Remailing Catholic Magazines

To the Editor of AMERICA:

As this is Catholic Press Month, may I take the liberty of reminding the readers of AMERICA how they can help the missions by remailing Catholic magazines for use in the mission field?

Here is an address that may be useful: Mrs. E. E. Williams, 34 Turner Road, Bandra, Bombay, India. Mrs. Turner disposes of hundreds of American Catholic magazines, selling the more recent ones for the benefit of the missions, and distributing the others free to people who cannot afford to buy.

St. Louis.

CHARLES SALDANHA, S.J.